Arnold Baker.

memory Pauline Epistle

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/introductiontost0000john_o2b5

An Introduction

To the Study of the Books
of the

NEW TESTAMENT

By John H. Kerr, D. D.
Author of "A Harmony of the Gospels"

With an Introductory Note by
Professor Benjamin B. Warfield, D. D.

Ninth Edition, Revised

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1892, by

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

All Rights Reserved.

To

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D. D.,

Professor of Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary,
this book is gratefully inscribed,
inasmuch as
its inception and completion are largely due
to his kind encouragement
and
wise counsel.

Preface.

THIS book is the outgrowth of a series of sermons preached on the Gospels nine years ago in my first pastoral charge. These sermons were rewritten and published in the *Presbyterian Journal* of Philadelphia. Favorable notice having been accorded these articles, I was led to continue them by writing introductory articles to the other books of the New Testament for the same paper. The kind encouragement and advice of Professor Warfield, under whose able instruction in Western Theological Seminary of Allegheny, Pa., I was permitted to study for four years, led me to think of rewriting the whole series with the view of publishing them in book form when completed. As my ministry progressed, I was also impressed with the need of having a popular treatise on New Testament Introduction for uses of instruction among the people of my charge. These things led me on in my work until it is now completed. To the wise council and timely criticisms of Dr. Warfield I am deeply indebted, for through the years that have elapsed since the inception of this work, he has repeatedly encouraged me.

The original articles as they appeared in the *Presbyterian Journal* have been entirely rewritten, and I have attempted to make them more even in every way. By

using such fragments of time as could be spared from the many and regular duties of my ministry, the work has through many difficulties and after many delays been finished. I have striven to be independent in my investigations, and to call no man my master. I have availed myself of all sources of information that I could command, and have traversed the whole ground covered in this book a number of times. I have freely quoted from various authorities, and some names appear frequently upon the pages of this book because I have always found them to be safe guides. I have not striven to set forth any new and startling theories, such as are fashionable and popular in these days. Nor can I hope to have settled some of the intricate questions that are touched upon by the science of Introduction. The effort has been made to present, not the processes of study, but the results of patient, painstaking investigations.

Professor Weiss in the Preface to his masterly Manual of Introduction to the New Testament, says: "In my view, the main thing in an Introduction to the New Testament is neither criticism nor apologetics, but the actual initiation into a living historical knowledge of Scripture." This states exactly my own view. New Testament Introduction must underlie all intelligent study of the Book. The order in which the sciences in regard to the New Testament should be studied is, first, Introduction; second, Textual Criticism; third, Exegesis; and, fourth, Apologetics. We must first ascertain whatever is ascertainable in regard to the historical setting of the component parts of the New Testament. In pursu-

ing this plan, I have followed in general the course pursued by Dr. Gloag in his valuable Introductions to the Pauline and Catholic Epistles. The order followed in the study of each book is, Canonicity, Authorship, Destination, Occasion and Object, Contents, Date and Place of Composition, and Peculiarities. To these subjects others have been added as occasion might require in the study of some of the books, but as a rule this order has been followed. None of these subjects have been treated with the exhaustiveness found in more elaborate treatises, and many interesting subjects have been entirely omitted, but this has arisen from the desire to avoid cumbersomeness and to keep the whole treatise within the proper limits for its destined object.

The books to which I would confess peculiar indebtedness are Conybeare and Howson's monumental work on the Life and Letters of St. Paul, and Dr. Gloag's Introductions to the Pauline and Catholic Epistles and the Johannine Writings, as well as Dr. Warfield's Lectures to his students on the Catholic Epistles. All the leading Introductions have been repeatedly consulted, as well as any other available works that would shed any light on any of the subjects that are herein investigated. My most constant companion in all my study has been the Greek Testament.

It is with mixed feelings that I now put forth my Introduction. It is conservative in its tone, adhering closely to the old views in so far as they seemed to me to be correct. I am personally firmly convinced of the historicity and canonical authority of the twenty-seven

books that constitute the New Testament. And my hope is that what I have written may be of use to earnest Bible students in confirming their faith in these things in regard to the New Testament books. But while this work considers only the human side of the New Testament, let it be always remembered that it is the inspired Word of God. It must be handled reverentially and prayerfully, if we are to obtain from it that wisdom that will through it make us wise unto salvation.

JOHN H. KERR.

Rock Island, Ill., May 9, 1892.

Preface to Second Edition.

THE call for a second edition of this book seems to be an evidence that it has found a place in the needs of students of the New Testament, and also that its mission in that direction is not yet completed. If this inference is correct there is reason, then, why it should appear in this second edition in a substantially unchanged form.

Typographical errors have been carefully noted and corrected and two changes have been made in the matter of dates. It has seemed to me on further examination that the date of the Council of Jerusalem must be placed as early as 50 A. D., in order to make room for all that transpired between the departure of Paul from Antioch on his second missionary journey (Acts 15 : 40), and his arrival at Corinth in the latter part of 52 A. D. (Acts 18 : 1). I have also been constrained to date Second Timothy before the winter of 2 Tim. 4 : 21 ; Titus 3 : 12, which I now believe to have been the winter of 67 A. D., if not even earlier.

Since the appearance of the first edition of this book, six years ago, there have been many valuable contributions made to this general subject by some of the greatest scholars of the present age. Such Introductions on the whole or parts of the New Testament as those of Holtzmann, Jülicher, Zahn, Godet and Gloag, together with the writings on kindred subjects by such as Harnack, Weiss, Ramsay, McGiffert and others, show that the New Testament still furnishes material for literary and historical criticism. It surely is not claiming too much,

when it is affirmed that the trend of thought has been on the whole decidedly in the direction of conservative views. There have been at times slight eddies in the currents of thought, when it has seemed for a little while as though they had reversed their direction. But these have been only temporary checks to the forward progress, and have really only added greater force to those currents, when, refusing to be turned aside any longer, they have flowed onward. Some questions have become absolutely settled, while others are nearing their solution. The work of Ramsay and Blass has made more sure the historicity and Lucan authorship of the Acts. Despite individual objectors the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles has never commanded wider assent than since Weiss and Zahn and Godet have written in their defense. The most difficult problem of all, that of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, is doubtless not as far from its correct solution as it was; while a greater number than ever before acknowledge the Fourth Gospel as a genuine Johannean product.

It is a matter of no little gratification to me that many of the positions herein advocated are among the most certainly accepted to-day. I trust that this work will continue to fill a place in the better understanding and defense of the scriptures of the New Testament. With deep gratitude for the favorable reception of the first edition, I put forth this second and revised edition in the humble hope that it may still be of use to many in studying the human origins and circumstances of the various books of the New Testament.

JOHN H. KERR.

San Rafael, California, August 5, 1898.

Preface to the Seventh Edition.

SINCE the issue of the First Edition of this book there have been many changes of front with reference to many of the questions covered by the general subject of New Testament Introduction. There was a time when it was possible to speak of Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and Galatians as the "undisputed" Epistles of Paul, meaning thereby that there was practical unanimity in the critical world in acknowledging their Pauline authorship. That can hardly be said any longer. Indeed, there is scarcely a position held by the church with reference to any book of the New Testament that has not been assailed by the rampant radical criticism of the day. Everything is questioned or disputed by some one somewhere. Nor are these assaults confined to the ranks of an avowedly hostile, unbelieving criticism. And the theories which come forth with almost startling rapidity are not all "made in Germany," though that is their most prolific source. In this country, as well as in England, there are prominent biblical teachers who have been "running amuck" through the New Testament. No position is too time-honored or well-entrenched to be safe from their attacks, and there seems to be even less probability of peace than ever before.

One may well wonder, when the doughty champion

of some new theory comes forth armed *cap-a-pie*, whether we will ever be permitted to enjoy peaceful possession of territory that has been fairly won, and to feel that any question is ever settled once and for all. Must we ever be on the defensive? Are we to be compelled to keep armed forces in each citadel, no matter how strong its natural defences may be? These are pertinent questions in view of the situation that confronts us in these days. Of course there must be no suppression of the truth, and no hindrance to full and free investigation, but there ought to be some way of determining when a question is really settled. It is true that many of the theories that are brought forth are sufficiently answered by their mere statement, but have we no protection against irresponsible men whose very existence as theorists is dependent on their producing something new and bizarre?

The call for a Seventh Edition of this book is evidence that it still has a mission to perform, and that there are many who regard the positions that are taken in it as the most defensible. Naturally the author is glad that it is to be permitted to go on telling its story. He offers no apology for letting it go forth again without any material changes in its contents. To him the Scriptures are both "sacred" and "inspired of God." It is his hope that his book will continue to be a real help to a better understanding of the "living and active" Word of God.

J. H. K.

Brooklyn, N. Y., June 22, 1915.

Introductory Note.

By The Rev. Dr. B. B. Warfield.

I feel very deeply the honor which Mr. Kerr has done me in inscribing to me this book,—the first fruits, but we all hope by no means the last fruits, of his studies in the New Testament. Certainly it is a pleasure to be allowed to commend to the wide public of Bible-students for which it is designed, this sober and serious attempt to popularize the study of the human origin and characteristics of that body of literature which God has made the depository of His Gospel.

The New Testament is far more than a body of literature. It is the Word of God. It is not simply the literary product of the Church of the first age. It is the gift of God to the Church of all ages. Neither in the composition of its individual books, nor in the collection of those books into a "Canon," can it be justly looked upon as the creation of the literary genius or of the selective instincts of the Church. The books were given one by one by the authoritative founders of the Church,—the Apostles whom Christ had chosen and whom the Spirit had endowed,—to the Church which they founded, as its authoritative Rule of Faith and Practice, its *corpus juris;* and the Book formed itself out of these authoritative books and differentiated itself by

this simple fact from all other books or collections of books. The principle of the Canon has ever been Apostolic gift, never fitness to edify or adaptation to the Christian consciousness: authoritativeness is its note. And when a Christian approaches it, he approaches it not merely as a book which he finds spiritually helpful, far less, merely as one which he finds literarily interesting, but as the Oracles of God.

Nevertheless, God did not give us these books, as He gave Moses the Ten Words, written without human intermediation, by His own finger, on the tables of stone. He gave them not only by, but through men. They are the Oracles of God, and every word of them is a word of God. But they are also the writings of men, and every word of them is a word of man. By a perfect confluence of the divine and human, the one word is at once all divine and all human. So then, for their proper and complete understanding, we must approach each book not only as the Word of God, but also as the words of Peter, or of Paul, or of John. We must seek to understand its human author in his most intimate characteristics, in his trials, experiences and training, in the especial circumstances of joy or sorrow, of straits or deliverance, in which he stood when writing this book, in his relations to his readers, and to the immediate needs and special situation of his readers which gave occasion for his writing,—in all, in a word, which went to make him an author, and just the author which he was,—in order that we may understand the Word of God which these words of His servants are. And we

must approach the Book as a whole, with our eyes open to the relations borne by part to part,—their chronological order, their mutual interdependencies and interrelations, their several places in the advancing delivery of doctrine, in the development of Christian life, in the elaboration of Church organization and worship,—in order that we may understand the method of God in creating His Church through the labors of these, His servants. This vast field is embraced in that literary study of the New Testament to which, it is to be hoped, Mr. Kerr's book will introduce many to whom it may have hitherto seemed too remote or too recondite.

Let us look for a moment at the chronological list of New Testament books which Mr. Kerr gives us in the table on page xxiii:—

Note how interesting even such "a dry list" may become through what it suggests as to the relations of the books to one another, when they are viewed organically as a body of literature. Consider the obvious domination of Paul throughout nearly the whole list, until Paul passes out of view at the close of the seventh Christian decade, and John fills the spacious time of the end of the century with his Spirit-attuned voice. And, then, consider the grouping of the books. We observe the first light of the early dawn of Christian literature in the Epistle of James; and we cannot fail to remark the aroma of "beginningness" which rises from every verse of that beautiful relic of really primitive Christianity, in which the Church is a synagogue, and the sins that break its purity and peace are still the sins of Jewish

temperament and Jewish inheritance. Then we have a long series of Paul's Epistles,—from Thessalonians to Romans,—and observe already the ascendency of this Apostle in early Christian literature, leading us to think of its first epoch as the first Pauline period. Then come the first Gospels; and here, at the end of the sixth decade of the century, we may draw a deep line, and say that the Beginnings are over. What we may call the central literary period now emerges into view. How Pauline it is! First, there is a central body of Paul's letters; and then a sequence of histories and epistles deeply imbued (with the exception of Jude) with the Pauline spirit, and exhibiting with striking clearness the supremeness of Paul's influence throughout the whole formative age of the Church. The central period closes, and is followed by a remarkable series of writings which have this common feature,—that they all may be looked upon as the leave-taking of the Apostles from the Church which they have established. We may consider them the legacy to the Church, in order, of Paul, of Peter, and of John,—the whole closing with that long, steady glow in the western heavens, illuminating the whole pathway of the Church through time, which is fitly called the Apocalypse.

On the opposite page, I have sought to represent this grouping in diagram. It is sufficiently striking to add likelihood to the chronological scheme on which it is founded. And if we will look a little deeper, we may perceive lines of development running through the sequence of writings, which go far toward demonstrating

TABLE

SHOWING THE PERIODS OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

James	45	Dawn.	The Beginnings of Apostolic Literature.	The Founding of the Church.
1 Thessalonians	52	First Pauline Period.		
2 Thessalonians	53			
Galatians	57			
1 Corinthians	57			
2 Corinthians	57			
Romans	58			
Matthew	c 58	First Gospels.		
Luke	c 60			
Colossians	62	Central Pauline Period.	The Central Period of Apostolic Literature.	The Establishing of the Church.
Ephesians	62			
Philemon	62			
Philippians	63			
Acts	c 64			
Hebrews	64			
1 Peter	64			
Jude	c 66			
1 Timothy	67	Paul's Legacy.	The Closing of Apostolic Literature.	The Leaving of the Church.
Titus	67			
2 Timothy	68			
2 Peter	68	Peter's Legacy.		
Mark	68			
John	90	John's Legacy.		
1 John	90			
2 John	91			
3 John	91			
Revelation	96			

the general correctness of the order which has been assigned them. All the books which I have classed under the caption of The Beginnings of Christian Literature, share with the Epistle of James the primitive flavor. The Epistles to the Thessalonians obviously belong to the infancy of the Church, when men were learning the first principles of the faith,—God and the Judgment. The questions connected with the mode and ground of salvation, with which the great Epistles to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans are busied, were characteristic of the transition from Judaism to Christianity. And the supplying of both the Jewish and Gentile sections of the Church with their appropriate Gospel, was a necessary element in the foundation of these Churches. The Church having once been founded, new needs arose and new questions pressed for solution. The faith had been delivered; now it needed establishing. The discussions as to the Person of Christ and His relation to His Body, the Church, which occupy the foreground in the central group of Paul's letters, could not have sprung up in the first infancy of the Church. It belongs to manhood to wrestle with the philosophy of its faith. Nor are histories of the foundation of a society, such as we have in the book of Acts, written, until the society is conscious that the foundations are already laid. Hebrews, First Peter, and Jude are as distinctively not evangelizing, but confirming literature. All the writings of this central period, thus, correspond with the place assigned to them chronologically: they are characteristic of the early maturity of the Church. Equally loudly do the

contents of the remaining books proclaim themselves to belong to the period of the departure of the Apostles. It is not arbitrarily that Paul busies himself in the Pastoral Epistles, with the organization of the Churches: it is because the Churches had grown so numerous and so large that questions of organization had become pressing,—it is because the time was drawing near when they should be left to self-government, without his inspired guidance. And as Paul wrote Second Timothy when he was already being poured out and the time of his departure was come, so Peter wrote Second Peter in full realization that the putting off of his tabernacle was coming swiftly, and in order to promise to his readers the memoirs of an eye-witness to Christ's majesty: it is Peter's swan-song. John's whole body of writings bears witness to a Church long-established, and may be justly looked upon as the farewell of the Apostolate to the Churches they had founded. Hence the Gospel of the Spirit, the final Gospel, and its strengthening accompanying letter. Hence the typical messages to the Churches, opening that immortal vision which uncovers to glad eyes the course of the great conflict through time, by which Christ is putting His enemies under His feet, and the glories of the final victory. Only with these is the deposit of faith made complete, the basis of hope impregnable, and the revelation of God's love perfect.

This meager hint may serve as some sort of a sample of how, as we study the literary history of the New Testament, we may gain broader and deeper conceptions

of God's method in giving His Word to man, and so also a fuller apprehension of the supreme value of these precious books and their fitness to meet every human need. May Mr. Kerr's excellent volume prove to many, an introduction not only to the study of the human conditions and methods by which these books came to man, but also to a fuller understanding of the loving care of our God and Saviour for His flock.

Princeton, May, 1892.

Table of Contents.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

General Introduction 1

CHAPTER II.

The Gospels—General Introduction 4
I. Their Number and Order 4
II. Their Characteristics 6
III. Their Origin 8

CHAPTER III.

The Gospels—Special Introduction 16
I. The Gospel according to Matthew 16
II. The Gospel according to Mark 28
III. The Gospel according to Luke 42
IV. The Gospel according to John 55

CHAPTER IV.

The Acts of the Apostles 74

CHAPTER V.

The Pauline Epistles—General Introduction 87
I. The Life and Character of Paul 87
II. The Writings of Paul 95

CHAPTER VI.

The Pauline Epistles—Special Introduction 98
1. The Early Epistles 98
I. First Thessalonians 98
II. Second Thessalonians 107
III. Galatians 113
IV. First Corinthians 124
V. Second Corinthians 133
VI. Romans 145
2. The Epistles of the Captivity 156
VII. Colossians 157
VIII. Philemon 167
IX. Ephesians 175
X. Philippians 187
3. The Pastoral Epistles 198
XI. First Timothy 205
XII. Titus 215
XIII. Second Timothy 222

CHAPTER VII.

The Epistle to the Hebrews 230

CHAPTER VIII.

The Catholic Epistles—General Introduction 247
I. James 249
II. First Peter 263
III. Second Peter 277
IV. First John 286
V and VI. Second and Third John 296
VII. Jude 303

CHAPTER IX.

The Revelation 311

Index of Authors and Subjects 327

TABLE

SHOWING THE DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION, AND THE AUTHORS OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Book.	Date.	Place.	Author.
James	45	Jerusalem . . .	James, the brother of our Lord.
1 Thessalonians	52	Corinth	Paul, the Apostle.
2 Thessalonians	53	"	" " "
Galatians . . .	57	Ephesus	" " "
1 Corinthians .	57	"	" " "
2 Corinthians .	57	Macedonia . . .	" " "
Romans . . .	58	Corinth	" " "
Matthew . . .	c 58	Jerusalem . . .	Matthew, the Apostle.
Luke	58–60	Cæsarea	Luke, the beloved Physician.
Colossians . .	62	Rome	Paul, the Apostle.
Philemon . . .	62	"	" " "
Ephesians . .	62	"	" " "
Philippians . .	63	"	" " "
Acts	63	"	Luke, the beloved Physician.
Hebrews . . .	c 64	"	Paul, the Apostle.
1 Peter	64	Babylon	Peter " "
Jude	c 66	Jerusalem (?) . .	Jude, the brother of our Lord.
1 Timothy . .	66	Macedonia . . .	Paul, the Apostle.
Titus	67	Ephesus	" " "
2 Timothy . .	67	Rome	" " "
2 Peter	68	En route to Rome	Peter " "
Mark	68	Rome	Mark.
John	90	Ephesus	John, the Apostle.
1 John	90	"	" " "
2 John	91	"	" " "
3 John	91	"	" " "
Revelation . .	96	Patmos . . .	" " "

An Introduction to the New Testament.

CHAPTER I.

General Introduction.

The Book that we are to study in this work is the New Testament. We speak of it as though it was only one book, while in reality it is made up of twenty-seven individual books. Of these books, five are historical, twenty-one are epistolary, and one is apocalyptic. They proceed from at least eight different writers, namely: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, James, Peter, and Jude. Four of these men were Apostles, Matthew, John, Paul, and Peter; two were intimate associates and companions of Apostles, Mark and Luke; and the other two were brethren of our Lord, James and Jude. These eight writers have their peculiar styles and modes of thought, differing from one another in these respects in many ways. And each book was written by its author with some specific purpose in view. But although the twenty-seven books constituting the New Testament were diverse in origin and purpose, and although small sections of the Church, or individual writers, have had their doubts as to the canonical authority of some of them, yet the Church as a whole has never recognized as

authoritative Scripture any other books than those now found in the New Testament, except, of course, the books constituting the Old Testament. From a very early date in the second century the New Testament Canon[1] has been a fixed quantity, even though the formal recognition of the twenty-seven books as a distinct and definite collection cannot be found until the time of the Council of Laodicea, 363 A. D.

It is not to be supposed, however, that the Canon was not a definite and fixed quantity long before the Council of Laodicea. "The formal declaration of the Canon was not by any means an immediate and necessary consequence of its practical settlement."[2] The books of the New Testament naturally, I might even say supernaturally, gravitated together. The Church, while allowing an ecclesiastical use to some of the so-called Apocryphal books, such as the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas, and others, never allowed a canonical authority to any others than those now in the New Testament. The Canon grew by virtue of the inherent divine authority of those books which came to constitute it, and it became fixed rather by the superintending power of its divine Inspirer than by any formal edict of the Church in any of its ecclesiastical bodies. As Professor Salmon writes, "It is a remarkable fact that we have no early interference of Church authority in the making of a Canon; no Council discussed this subject; no formal

[1] By this term "Canon" is meant that collection of books that constitutes the New Testament.

[2] Westcott's On the Canon of the New Testament, p. 5.

decisions were made. The Canon seems to have shaped itself; and if, when we come further on, you are disposed to complain of this because of the vagueness of the testimony of antiquity to one or two disputed books, let us remember that this non-interference of authority is a valuable topic of evidence to the genuineness of our Gospels; for it thus appears that it was owing to no adventitious authority, but by their own weight, that they crushed all rivals out of existence."[3]

A comparison of the books of the New Testament with the body of literature that sprang up soon after their composition will demonstrate the immeasurable superiority of the former over the latter. The Apocryphal Gospels are puerile and nonsensical in character and contents by the side of the four Gospels in the New Testament. You pass into a new atmosphere, and one that is earthly in every respect, when you turn from the former to the latter. The twenty-seven books, as soon as the slow and precarious methods of communication between those parts of the Church in which they had their origin permitted, became the recognized deposit of the divine revelation, and as such are indissolubly bound up in the one Book, which we call the New Testament.

[3] Salmon's Introd. to the New Testament, p. 144.

CHAPTER II.

The Gospels—General Introduction.

It is an inaccuracy, but one that scarcely can be avoided, to speak of these in the plural. It is in reality only one Gospel, although four-fold. Justin Martyr is the first writer who makes use of the term "the Gospels" technically, as applied to the four books that constitute the Gospel record. The general signification of the term up to his time had been that of the message of salvation. The word really means "good tidings," having reference to the character of the message it contained. The four books of the Gospel we have, do not pretend to be complete histories of the words and acts of the Saviour. They are rather biographical memoirs, which taken together constitute the one Gospel. To be literally correct in designating the various parts of this one Gospel, we should always say, not "Matthew's Gospel," or "Mark's Gospel," and so on, but "the Gospel according to Matthew," "the Gospel according to Mark," and so on. This unity must always be borne in mind, even though the common usage of terms should compel us to be at times slightly inaccurate.

I. THE NUMBER AND ORDER OF THESE BOOKS.

The number of the books composing the Gospel has always been four, and only four. The closest examination of the early Christian writings, so far as they have

been preserved, will show that canonical authority has never been accorded to any other Gospels than these four. There are a number of so-called Gospels besides these, but not one of them ever received any recognition at the hands of the Church. As early as 150 A. D., Tatian the Syrian made a harmonic arrangement of these four Gospels from a Syriac translation of them then in existence.[1] Irenæus enters into an elaborate argument to prove that there were only four real Gospels. He speaks of the fourfoldness of the Gospel, conforming itself to the analogy of the four quarters of the globe, the four chief winds, and the four faces of the cherubim. "He asserts that the four Gospels are the four pillars on which the Church rests as it covers the whole earth, and in this number four he recognizes a special token of the Creator's wisdom. . . . The acceptance of all the four was then of so long standing and so thoroughly complete, that the Bishop of Lyons could allude to the fourfoldness of the Gospel as a thing universally recognized, and in consequence of this very recognition speak of it as a thing which harmonizes with great and unchanging cosmical arrangements."[2]

"Upon a review of all the witnesses, from the Apostolic Fathers down to the Canon of the Laodicean Council in 363, and that of the third Council of Carthage in 397, in both of which the four Gospels are numbered in the Canon of Scripture, there can hardly be room for any candid person to doubt that from the first the four

[1] Tatian's Diatessaron.

[2] Tischendorf's Origin of the Four Gospels, p. 38.

Gospels were recognized as genuine and as inspired; that a sharp line of distinction was drawn between them and the so-called apocryphal Gospels, of which the number was very great; that, from the citations of passages, the Gospels bearing these four names were the same as those which we possess in our Bibles under the same names; that unbelievers, like Celsus, did not deny the genuineness of the Gospels, even when rejecting their contents; and, lastly, that heretics thought that it was necessary to plead some kind of sanction out of the Gospels for their doctrines; nor could they venture on the easier path of an entire rejection, because the Gospels were everywhere known to be genuine. As a matter of literary history, nothing can be better established than the genuineness of the Gospels."[3]

The order of the arrangement of these four books has always been the same as it now is in our Bibles. The Muratori Canon speaks of Luke as the third Gospel, and John as the fourth. As this Canon is fragmentary, and in the part now lost must have spoken of the first and second Gospels, we naturally infer that they were none other than Matthew and Mark respectively.

II. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THESE BOOKS.

That these four books have their marked and peculiar characteristics, is evident on a most cursory reading. As early a writer as Irenæus affirms that Matthew symbolizes the man; Mark, the eagle; Luke, the ox; and John, the lion. These ideas were taken up by later

[3] Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, p. 943.

writers and more fully developed. And while this is merely a quaint conceit of Irenæus and other writers, the basis of it is to be found in the differentiating features of these books, which at an early age were clearly recognized and which seemed to call for some explanation at the hands of those who accepted them. These features will be dwelt upon respectively as we study the books in their order, and there is no occasion to anticipate what will naturally be considered farther on. In their memoirs of Christ, the four Evangelists were guided in the selection of the material wrought into their records by the purposes they had in view in writing, as well as by the ultimate purposes of the inspiring Holy Spirit. Each one writes from his own standpoint, and we have in reality four different pictures of our Lord, delineated by four different artists as His wonderful personality appeared to their respective minds. The first three have been called the Synoptic Gospels,[4] because they more closely resemble one another in their general features, as well as in the ground they cover. The Fourth Gospel stands out in bold relief by itself, differentiated from the other three by many distinctive features.

Early tradition informs us that Matthew wrote his Gospel for the Jews; Mark for the Romans; Luke for the Greeks; and John for Christians in general. There is no question of the general truth of this early belief, for the Evangelists had before their minds as they wrote the needs of these respective classes of persons. It must

[4] Dr. Dods defines this term as meaning, "giving a general view of the same series of events in the life of Christ."

be remembered, however, that as none of the Epistles were addressed to unbelievers, so none of the Gospels were written for those who were not Christians. The distinctive characteristics of these books arose from their respective occasions and objects.

III. THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS.

No more difficult problem confronts the student of the Gospels than that of their origin. One is struck with the fact that between them there are the most remarkable resemblances, and at the same time equally striking differences. This has given rise to the so-called Synoptic and Johannean problems. We naturally deal with the Synoptic Gospels by themselves, for the narrative of the Fourth Gospel coincides with the other three in only a few passages. John in the main in his Gospel covers different ground from that of the other three. The most reasonable explanation of the differences that exist between his Gospel and the other three is, that John writing last of all, and much later than the others, had seen their Gospels, and purposely omitted the bulk of the matter that they had already recorded.

Taking the Synoptic Gospels, we find a large amount of actual agreement in arrangement and detail. "If we suppose the histories that they contain to be divided into sections, in 42 of these all three narratives coincide, 12 more are given by Matthew and Mark only, 5 by Mark and Luke only, and 14 by Matthew and Luke. To these must be added 5 peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark, and 9 to Luke; and the enumeration is complete. But

this applies to general coincidence as to the facts narrated; the amount of verbal coincidence, that is, the passages either verbally the same, or coinciding in the use of many of the same words, is much smaller." Professor Norton writes: "By far the larger portion of this verbal agreement is found in the recital of the words of others, and particularly of the words of Jesus. Thus, in Matthew's Gospel, the passages verbally coincident with one or both of the other two Gospels amount to less than a sixth part of its contents; and of this about seven eighths occur in the recital of the words of others, and only about one eighth in what, by way of distinction, I may call mere narrative, in which the Evangelist, speaking in his own person, was unrestrained in the choice of his expressions. In Mark, the proportion of coincident passages to the whole contents of the Gospel is about one sixth, of which not one fifth occurs in the narrative. Luke has still less agreement of expression with the other Evangelists. The passages in which it is found amount only to about a tenth part of his Gospel, and but an inconsiderable portion of it appears in the narrative portion — less than a twentieth part. These proportions should be further compared with those which the narrative part of each Gospel bears to that in which the words of others are professedly repeated. Matthew's narrative occupies about one fourth of his Gospel; Mark's about one half, and Luke's about one third. It may easily be computed, therefore, that the proportion of verbal coincidence found in the narrative part of each Gospel, compared with what exists in

the other part is about in the following ratios: In Matthew as one to somewhat more than two, in Mark as one to four, and in Luke as one to ten."[5]

It is evident from these words of Professor Norton that, while there is a vast amount of remarkable agreement, there is also a great deal of difference between them. Westcott says: "If the total contents of the several Gospels be represented by 100, the following table is obtained:—

	Peculiarities.	Concordances.
"Mark	7	93
Matthew	42	58
Luke	59	41
(John	92	8)"

From this table it will be seen that Mark has the least amount of matter peculiar to himself. In fact there are only about 24 verses in Mark that are not paralleled in either, or both, Matthew and Luke. Matthew has more concordances than peculiarities, and Luke has more peculiarities than concordances.

The great question now is, How are we to account for these peculiarities, as well as concordances? We must find a theory that will work both ways, that is, that while accounting for the coincidences, will also explain the peculiarities. This is the difficulty. Many different theories have been propounded, but they all fail to satisfy entirely the conditions that are met. Three general theories suggest themselves. *First*, the Synoptists depend on one another. These three are capable of six different combinations, namely; Matthew, Mark,

[5] Norton's Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. I., p. 240.

Luke; Matthew, Luke, Mark; Mark, Luke, Matthew; Mark, Matthew, Luke; Luke, Mark, Matthew; Luke, Matthew, Mark. Each one of these combinations has had its advocates. It is to be noted that in this list the title of a Gospel is sometimes set down where, to be strictly accurate, some form of the Gospel which is supposed to have preceded the canonical book is meant. Now there is absolutely no direct evidence that the Synoptists saw one another's works. Luke certainly cannot have had in mind either of the other two, when he refers to the earlier attempts to write the Gospel history. This theory "degrades one or two Synoptists to the position of slavish and yet arbitrary compilers, not to say plagiarists; it assumes a strange mixture of dependence and affected originality; it weakens the independent value of their history; and it does not account for the omissions of most important matter, and for many differences in common matter." *Second*, the Synoptists are independent of one another, and depend on older common sources. This independence of these writers is borne out by the fact that they frequently differ where agreement would most certainly be expected. Then at the same time there are the most striking coincidences. These latter may be accounted for on the basis of a common source, while their independence may explain their divergences. *Third*, the Synoptists are dependent both on one another and on older sources. But, if we reject the first theory, we must also reject this one, for the same arguments will hold against the first part of this theory that do against it.

It is noticeable that the resemblances occur mostly, and as we would naturally expect, in the recitative portions, and the differences in the narrative. Some writers revert again and again to the statement of Papias, who affirms that Matthew wrote the "oracles" in Hebrew. Calling the "oracles" the original Matthew, they claim that it contained the discourses of Christ alone and was the basis of all the Gospels. Other writers however claim that "oracles" as used by Papias, does not necessarily mean only discourses, but that the term can be applied to narrative as well as to recitative portions. Others seek for an original Aramaic written Gospel which the Evangelists have translated, and as independent translators have not always used the same words to express the original.[6] In this way they would account for the verbal differences. And, indeed, it does give a satisfactory explanation of variations that are confined to words. But, as Professor Salmon[7] well says, "The hypothesis of an Aramaic original does not suffice to explain all the phenomena. For there are very many passages where the Evangelists agree in the use of Greek words, which it is not likely could have been hit on independently by different translators. If such cases are to be explained by the use of a common original, that original must have been in the Greek language."[8]

In regard to Matthew, it must be remembered that he was a personal witness of many of the facts, as well as a

[6] See Articles of Prof. Marshall in the Expositor of 1891.

[7] Salmon's Introd. to the N. T., p. 173.

[8] It is impossible in the limits of this work to even state the many

hearer of many of the words of Christ, which he records. Mark, the companion of Peter, gives also practically an autoptic Gospel. Luke tells us plainly that his sources were written records, fragmentary in their character, and the oral testimony of eye witnesses. Then further, in our historical studies, we must not lose sight of the supernatural element in the composition of these Gospels, that is, the superintendence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The apostolic preaching, as Dr. Schaff says, "was chiefly historical, a recital of the wonderful public life of Jesus of Nazareth, and centered in the crowning facts of the crucifixion and resurrection. The story was repeated in public and in private from day to day and sabbath to sabbath. The Apostles and primitive Evangelists adhered closely and reverently to what they saw and heard from their divine Master and their disciples faithfully reproduced their testimony." [9]

At the first, the need of authoritative written records did not exist. The facts of Christ's life and His words were fresh and vivid in their memories. Living words were sufficient for the present needs of the believers, but the Church grew and soon included those who had no personal knowledge of those facts and words. "The wide growth of the Church furnished them with an adequate motive for adding a written record to the testimony of their living words; and the very form of the Gospels was only determined by the experience of

different theories that have been advanced. The reader is referred to the most elaborate treatises on this subject for a review of the ideas that have been advanced.

[9] History of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 603.

teaching. The work of an Evangelist was thus not the simple result of divine inspiration or of human thought, but rather the complex issue of both when applied to such a selection of Christ's words and works as the varied phases of apostolic preaching had shown to be best suited to the wants of men. The primary Gospel was proved, so to speak, in life, before it was fixed in writing. Out of the countless multitude of Christ's acts, those were gathered, which were seen to have the fullest representative significance for the exhibition of His divine life. The oral collection thus formed became in every sense coincident with the 'Gospel'; and our Gospels are the permanent compendium of its contents." [10]

In view of these facts, we may feel confident that the oral preaching of the early days was the real basis of the Gospels. The customs and training of those days, when of books there were none, and manuscripts were unhandy, led to habits of memorizing. The living words of Christ were ineffaceably burned into the minds of His followers. The same facts were repeated over and over again, until finally they were fairly stereotyped in their minds. In recording the words of Christ, the Evangelists naturally harmonize very closely with one another. But since the words of Christ were frequently associated with attendant circumstances, it is not surprising that differences should appear in the narrative portions of the writings, as this one thought of one circumstance and that one another. Thus they were both independent and dependent. Their individual

[10] Westcott's Introd. to the Study of the Gospels, p. 178.

minds, as well as the specific purposes for which they wrote, led them to differences of expression, as well as to the selection of different material. Mark, though written last of the three, represents most clearly the briefest form of the early preaching; while Matthew and Luke give the same in more extended form, and as their purposes demanded. To use the words of Dr. Schaff, "We conclude, then, that the Synoptists prepared their Gospels independently, during the same period, in different places, chiefly from the living teaching of the first disciples, which was the common property of the Church. Their agreement and disagreement are not the result of design, but of the unity, richness, and variety of the original story as received, understood, digested, and applied by different minds to different conditions and classes of hearers and readers." [11]

[11] Schaff's History, Vol. I., p. 606. The Johannean and Synoptic Problems are among the most difficult in the New Testament. They still attract the industry and ingenuity of scholars. The literature that has been produced on the Origin of the Gospels is very voluminous. I can only refer the reader, who may wish to enter more fully into the matter, to other works which enter more into details, such as, Westcott's Introduction to the Gospels; Stanton's Gospels as Historical Documents; Holdsworth's Gospel Origins; Burkitt's The Gospel History and Its Transmission; the articles on the Gospel in Smith's and Hastings' Bible Dictionaries, together with the various Introductions to the New Testament, Gloag, Salmon, Davidson, Zahn, Jülicher, Dods, Bleek, Peake, Moffatt and others.

CHAPTER III.

The Gospels—Special Introduction.

We will now take up the study of the individual books composing the Gospel, in the order in which they stand.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

I. Canonicity.

The external evidence to the early existence of this book, and to its acceptance as a part of the sacred Canon, is very strong. It undoubtedly begins with the earliest Christian writings. The so-called Apostolic Fathers, namely; Clement of Rome (96), Barnabas (106), Ignatius (115), and Polycarp (116), give positive evidence not only of their acquaintance with it, but also of their acceptance of it, although none of them formally mention it by name. The Epistle to Diognetus (117) uses its language, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120) manifestly borrows from it. In the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (115) there are "in all four literal or nearly literal quotations from Matthew, and about eighteen references to Matthew." The Second Epistle of Clement (130) quotes a passage of it as Scripture. Papias (120–130) speaks of Matthew by name, making the statement that "Matthew wrote the oracles in Hebrew." This Papias was a companion

of Polycarp and a hearer of the Apostle John. His statement warrants the inference that in his day there was an authoritative Greek Gospel according to Matthew. Justin Martyr (145) indubitably used all four Gospels, for he speaks of the "memoirs of the Apostles which are called Gospels." It is also to be noted in regard to Justin that the great mass of the citations he makes are from Matthew. Tatian (150), the pupil of Justin Martyr, made a harmonic arrangement of the Gospels in Syriac.

There are also unmistakable references to and coincidences with this Gospel in the writings of certain early heretics and heretical sects, among whom were the Simonians (100–120), and Basilides (125) and Valentinus (140). In the Clementine Homilies (c 150) there are at least eighteen references to peculiar and characteristic passages of Matthew. Claudius Apollinaris (175) speaks of Matthew by name. Dionysius of Corinth (148–176), Hegesippus (157–176), and Athenagoras (177) in their writings made allusions to this book, Dionysius mentioning Matthew's name. It is universally admitted that Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195), as well as all succeeding Christian writers, cite the First Gospel as Matthew's and as of divine authority.

In all there are twenty-one witnesses before the end of the second century to the existence and use of Matthew. And this testimony comes from all parts of the Church without an exception. Of such a character is this volume of testimony that it is sufficient to establish the canonical authority of the book.

II. Authorship.

In this book there is nothing to indicate its author. "The author does not personally come forward, nor does he give us any hints as to who he is, or what his circumstances are." Tradition, however, unanimously assigns this book to Matthew the Apostle. This man is also called Levi, the son of Alphæus (Mark 2 : 14). All three of the Synoptists relate the call of Matthew by the Saviour in the same way, except that while Matthew calls himself Matthew, Mark and Luke call him Levi (Matt. 9 : 9; Mark 2 : 14; Luke 5 : 27–29). The attempt has been made to prove that Matthew and Levi were different persons, but the agreement in language and contents between the passages that contain these names is such as to prove that they were but different names of the same individual. It is noticeable that while Mark and Luke in their lists of the Apostles give the name of Matthew before that of Thomas (Mark 3 : 18; Luke 6 : 15), Matthew himself gives his own name after it. It is also a mark of the humility of Matthew that in his list he appends to his name the words "the publican." Matthew was sitting at the receipt of custom, engaged in his business as a tax collector, when the Saviour called upon him to follow Him. Some time after this call, Matthew made a feast for Jesus, at which a number of publicans and sinners were present. No other mention is made of Matthew except in Acts 1 : 13, from which we learn that he still retained his place among the Apostles, and was with them in the upper chamber, waiting

and praying for the promised coming of the Holy Spirit. As to his father Alphæus nothing is known. He doubtless was a different person from Alphæus, the father of James the less. As there is no mention of Matthew's kinship to our Lord either in the New Testament or in tradition, we infer that there were two men of the name of Alphæus.

Papias is the first person who expressly names Matthew as the author of one of the Gospels. To no other person is this book ascribed. His position as a publican, or tax collector, was one that brought him in contact with many of the people. This office was especially hated by the Jews, and those who held it were generally regarded as outcasts by their countrymen, although Matthew and Zacchæus seem to have been men of good qualities, and were notable exceptions to the general character of the men who usually held it. Matthew must certainly have been possessed of special qualifications for the apostolic office to which the Saviour called him. Jesus defended Himself for His associations with this class of people, by saying to the fault-finding Pharisees, "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. . . . I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." The selection of one of this class "implies that already the Lord was turning away from the legally righteous, the Pharisees, because His words found so little entrance into their hearts, and was turning to those who, though despised as publicans and sinners, were nevertheless ready to receive the truth. Unable to draw the priests into His service, He calls fishermen; and

what He cannot accomplish because of the unbelief of Pharisees, He will do through the faith of publicans."[1]

Tradition busies itself with Matthew's name, sending him to various places, such as Parthia, Persia, and Ethiopia. Upon none of these traditions, however, can we positively rely, and we have no certain knowledge of his movements after Pentecost. He probably lived for a good many years after that event, for the words in his Gospel imply that considerable time had elapsed since the resurrection of our Lord (28 : 15). "If the first feeling on reading these meagre particulars be disappointment, the second will be admiration for those who, doing their duty under God in the great work of founding the Church on earth, have passed away to their Master in heaven without so much as an effort to redeem their names from silence and oblivion."

III. Language in which Originally Written.

This is a difficult question, one on which prominent scholars are very much divided. Papias tells us that "Matthew wrote the articles in the Hebrew dialect." Irenæus writes, "Matthew among the Jews did also publish a Gospel in writing in their own language." Eusebius informs us that Pantænus was reported to have found in India copies of "the Gospel of Matthew which was written in Hebrew." Origen's testimony is that "the first (Gospel) was written by Matthew, once a publican, afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew

[1] Andrews' Life of Our Lord, p. 238.

language." Jerome's testimony seems at first sight to be final and to settle this matter, for he says, "Matthew . . . first of all wrote a Gospel of Christ in Judea in the Hebrew language and letters, for the sake of those of the circumcision who believed: who afterwards translated it into Greek is uncertain. Moreover the very Hebrew Gospel is in the library at Cæsarea, which was collected with great care by Pamphilus the martyr. With the leave of the Nazarenes who live at Berœa in Syria, and use that volume, I took a copy."

Apparently these positive statements ought to settle this matter. But we have no Matthew now except in Greek. What has become of the Hebrew original of which all these writers speak so freely? And what is the relation of this original Hebrew Matthew to our Greek Matthew? This latter question is answered by some, who say that Matthew himself before his death made a free Greek translation of his own original Hebrew Gospel; while others affirm that some unknown person made the translation into Greek, which soon supplanted the original Hebrew. Jerome tells us that "who afterwards translated it into Greek is uncertain."

There are, however, some strong arguments to be advanced in favor of a Greek original rather than a Hebrew. (1.) The Hebrew original of which so many speak was never seen by any one of the witnesses. Even Jerome, who professes to have made a translation of it, in all probability made a mistake, having confounded an apocryphal Gospel called "The Nazarene Gospel," or "The Gospel according to the Hebrews,"

with the so-called Hebrew original of Matthew. "As time went on he certainly became more cautious about asserting, and usually quotes it as 'The Gospel written in the Hebrew language which the Nazarenes read,' and he sometimes adds, 'which is called by most the original of St. Matthew.'" Weiss says, "His commentary on Matthew certainly shows that he was not acquainted with a Hebrew original of Matthew, for he never makes use of it for purposes of explanation." It is certainly curious that none of these writers give absolute testimony to the existence of the Hebrew original of which they write. With them it is all hear-say testimony. They all use the Greek Matthew as though it was the original. (2.) Our Greek Matthew is manifestly not a translation from the Hebrew. "It is now generally admitted that our present Gospel of St. Matthew is not and cannot be a translation." Certain Hebrew (Aramaic) names are given and translated, as "Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us" (1 : 23); "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani, that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (27 : 46); "A place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull" (27 : 33). If our Greek Matthew is a translation from the Hebrew, why were the above Hebrew words retained in this translation? (3.) There is a strange confusion of Matthew with the so-called "Gospel according to the Hebrews," an early apocryphal Gospel. That apocryphal Gospel was similar in certain respects and in certain parts to our Matthew. This eventually led to a confusion of names that was not at first noticed. This is especially noticeable in

the writings of Jerome. This confusion probably arose in the first place with Papias. (4.) The early writers all use the Greek Matthew as authoritative. And in no place can we find any traces of the existence of any Hebrew text.

For these reasons, and others more technical that might be advanced, we conclude that, despite the apparently strong testimony the other way, Matthew wrote his Gospel originally in Greek, and not in Hebrew or Aramaic. This seems to be the verdict of an increasing number of scholars.

IV. The Purpose of the Gospel.

As each of the Evangelists evidently had some definite purpose in the composition of his memoir of the life of our Lord, we naturally ask, What purpose did Matthew have in mind in the composition of his Gospel? The answer to this question is at hand. From the earliest days it has been held without any dissent, that Matthew wrote especially for Jewish Christians. That he does not write chronologically is very evident when we compare his Gospel with either Mark or Luke. Matthew groups sayings and events. He does not write a history, but an *historical argument*, in which he strives to confirm the Jewish Christians in their belief that Jesus Christ was the Messiah of Old Testament type and prophecy. Beginning by giving the *legal* ancestry of Jesus through His reputed father Joseph, he proves that He was the Son of David, the Son also of Abraham. Thus he gives at the very outset the documentary proof that Jesus was the legal heir of David and of the seed of Abraham. "In short the great object of the Apostle was to prove to

Jewish readers, that the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament received their accomplishment in Jesus of Nazareth; to demonstrate that Jesus had shown Himself by His doctrine and His deeds to be the seed of David, the Messiah long expected by the Jewish nation."[2]

In the line of this purpose, the Evangelist carefully notes some of the prophecies that had been fulfilled in the case of Jesus. Thus Jesus was born of a virgin (1 : 23), as Isaiah had foretold. His birth took place at Bethlehem (2 : 5–6) in accordance with Micah's words. Persecutions arose so that His parents were driven into Egypt, and thus Hosea's prophecy that "out of Egypt have I called my son," was fulfilled (2 : 15). Christ dwelt in Nazareth "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene" (2 : 23). He had a forerunner as Isaiah had predicted (3 : 3). Jesus left Nazareth and dwelt in Capernaum in accordance with the words of Isaiah (4 : 13–16). Isaiah had also said, "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses," and consequently Christ was found healing the sick and doing deeds of mercy wherever He went (8 : 17). And still another of the same prophet's words is claimed to have been fulfilled in Christ (12 : 15–21). His parabolic teaching was in harmony with prophecy (13 : 14, 35). As Zechariah had prophesied, Christ came into Jerusalem sitting upon an ass and a colt the foal of an ass (21 : 5). Jesus was betrayed, as it was written of Him (26 : 24). His capture in the garden of Gethsemane was accomplished "that the scripture of the

[2] Davidson's Introd. to the N. T., 1st Ed., p. 3.

prophets might be fulfilled" (26 : 56). And the potter's field was purchased with the blood money, as Jeremiah the prophet had said (27 : 9).

That those for whose instruction and benefit Matthew primarily wrote were Jews, is thus borne out by the manner in which the Old Testament is used. The general Jewish cast of the matter is also in the same direction. A thorough acquaintance with Jewish customs is manifested which the writer assumes to be in common between himself and those for whom he wrote. And since the author and his readers occupied common ground, he does not pretend to explain ceremonial terms and customs, as the other Evangelists feel compelled to do.

From all this it is evident that the author wrote his Gospel with special reference to the needs of his fellow Jewish Christians, and to confirm them in their faith that Jesus Christ was the Messiah of Old Testament type and prophecy and promise.

V. The Contents of this Gospel.

I. The Genealogical Table. 1 : 1–17.
II. The Birth and Infancy of Jesus. 1 : 18–2 : 23.
III. Circumstances preparatory to His Public Ministry. 3 : 1–4 : 11.
IV. The Galilean Ministry. 4 : 12–18 : 35.
V. The Journey to Jerusalem. 19 : 1–20 : 34.
VI. The Residence in and about Jerusalem. 21 : 1–25 : 46.
VII. The last Passover, including the Betrayal, the Denial, the Trial, and the Crucifixion. 26 : 1–27 : 66.
VIII. The Resurrection. 28 : 1–20.

VI. The Date and Place of Composition.

It is impossible to determine exactly the date of the composition of this Gospel, and we can only hope to approximate it. The testimony of the early Church is that Matthew wrote his Gospel before the other Evangelists composed theirs. This testimony is so persistent and unanimous that it ought to have some weight in deciding this question. That it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, is evident. On the other hand, it is also certain that considerable time must have elapsed between certain events and the description of them by Matthew (27 : 7–8 ; 28 : 15). Luke very probably wrote his Gospel during the Cæsarean imprisonment of Paul, that is, from 58–60 A. D. Irenæus informs us that this Gospel was written while Peter and Paul were founding the church at Rome. But it is highly improbable that Peter was in Rome before the year 68 A. D., and consequently we cannot accept the statement of Irenæus in this matter. Now if this Gospel was written before Luke, it must have been written some time before 58 A. D. Some have placed the time of its composition as early as 34 A. D., but that is unquestionably too early. We are doubtless correct in dating it between 50 A. D. and 58 A. D.

The place of composition was evidently Judea, for such is the uniform testimony of antiquity, and everything in the book itself harmonizes with this. Whether it was written at Jerusalem cannot certainly be known, although it is generally supposed that it was composed in the holy city. By some it has been thought very probable

that it was written by Matthew as he was about to leave the city of Jerusalem for some point outside of Judea.

VII. The Peculiarities of this Gospel.

The peculiarities of Matthew are very marked. One noticeable feature is the frequency with which the Old Testament is quoted by him, there being no less than sixty-five passages that refer to it, of which forty-three are verbal citations. Christ is called "the Son of David" eight times. The phrase "kingdom of heaven" is used in thirty-three different places, while the other Evangelists uniformly say "kingdom of God." God is called the "heavenly Father" six times, and the "Father in heaven" sixteen times. There are some seventy words used by Matthew that are peculiar to himself, being found nowhere else in the New Testament. The indefinite particle of transition (tote) is used by him ninety times, while Mark uses it only six times, and Luke fourteen times.

"The symbolism is Jewish. Not to speak of other examples, the symbolism in number pervades the Gospel. Seven, ten, twelve, with their multiples repeatedly appear. The genealogy is arranged in three fourteens. There are fourteen parables divided by place and purpose into two sevens. There are twenty miracles separated in like manner into two tens. The number seven generally divides itself into four and three, the human and the divine. In the Sermon on the Mount, the Christian character is sketched in seven beatitudes (5 : 1–9). Of these the first four are exclusively human — they are states which Christ cannot share; the last three express emo-

tions and conduct which belong to God as well as to man. In the thirteenth chapter seven parables present the kingdom of heaven in various relations. The first four are from the human side, accidental, temporary, varying — the kingdom in its historical development, as man beholds it; the last three are inherent, essential — the kingdom as seen by Christ. The Lord's prayer has seven petitions; the first three relating to God, co-ordinate, coequal; the last four relating to man, joined by particles of sequence." [3]

This has been called the "kingly Gospel," for it is the Gospel that presents the Messianic King. Its teaching, for it is eminently didactic, revolves around the Kingship of Christ. Mark in his Gospel deals more with the facts and incidents of Christ's life, but Matthew emphasizes His teaching. Matthew portrays Christ "as the King who has come to the eternal throne of His father David." And it is fitting that this Gospel should come first, as the true link that connects the Old Testament with the New. "The long and chequered history related in the Old Testament finds its consummation and significance in the life of Jesus." Very fittingly, then, does this kingly Gospel stand first in the New Testament as its bond of union with the Old Testament.

II. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK.

I. Canonicity.

Owing to the fact that this Gospel contains comparatively little distinctive matter, we do not find many quo-

[3] Lectures on the N. T. (Amer. Tract Soc.). Dr. Weston on Matthew.

tations from it in the early Christian writings. But while this is true in general, we do not lack for sufficient witnesses to establish its right to a place in the New Testament Canon. Clement of Rome (96) directly quotes Mark 7 : 6.[4] In Eusebius' history we have a quotation from the writings of Papias (120–130), in which he informs us that Mark as "the interpreter of Peter wrote exactly whatever he remembered." There is no doubt that Papias in these words refers to our canonical Mark, for no other book of Mark's was known to antiquity. In regard to Justin Martyr (145) "all doubt of his acquaintance with it is excluded by the account of the naming of Zebedee's sons (Mark 3 : 16 ff.), which is expressly traced back to the Memoirs of Peter, *i. e.* to the Gospel of Mark."[5] Extant fragments from the writings of Ptolemæus (165) conclusively prove that he used Mark. The Muratori Canon (170) in its present fragmentary condition begins abruptly, . . . "those things at which he was present he placed thus. The third book of the Gospel, that according to Luke. . . . The fourth Gospel is that of John." It certainly is not unreasonable to infer that the lost part, referring to the first and second books of the Gospel, named Matthew and Mark as such. We can justly claim this Canon as a witness to the existence of Mark as well as of Matthew.

The great writers of the latter part of the second century, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, discuss the relation of Mark to Peter, and they do this in

[4] Clement of Rome. 15.2.

[5] Weiss' Manual of Introd. to the N. T., p. 59.

a way that shows that this Gospel was received in all quarters of the Church. Up to the latter part of the second century we have at least ten important witnesses to the existence and use of Mark as authoritative. These witnesses are from all parts of the Church, and are sufficient to establish the canonical authority of the book.

II. Authorship.

The book itself makes no claim as to its authorship, but the early Church without a dissenting voice affirmed that Mark was its author. The original Jewish name of the author was John, to which was added afterwards the Roman name Marcus, or Mark. In the Acts (12 : 12, 25 ; 15 : 37) we read, "John, whose surname was Mark." He is called John (Acts 13 : 13), and Mark (Acts 15 : 39; 2 Tim. 4 : 11), and Marcus (Col. 4 : 10; Philem. 24; 1 Pet. 5 : 13). It is evident that the Jewish name John was ere long discarded, for in the Epistles he always appears as Mark.

Mark was a Jew. His mother, whose name was Mary, owned a house in Jerusalem, indicating a measure of wealth in the family (Acts 12 : 12). Barnabas, the companion of Paul on the first missionary journey, was the cousin of Mark[6] (Col. 4 : 10, R. V.). The Apostle Peter calls Mark his son (1 Pet. 5 : 13), but he unquestionably does so in the same sense that Paul calls Timothy his son. When Peter was cast into prison by Herod Agrippa (44 A. D.), the believers were gathered at the house of Mark's mother praying for the Apostle's deliverance. And when he was released by the angel,

[6] Incorrectly rendered "sister's son" in the A. V.

Peter naturally turned to that rendezvous of the Christians. Evidently there was a degree of familiarity existing between the two families. It was through the influence of Peter that Mark was brought to Christ, thus becoming Peter's spiritual son.

It is this Gospel that records the fact that at the time of the arrest of Christ, "there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked" (14: 51–52). It has been inferred that this nameless young man was none other than the author of this Gospel. "The most probable view is that St. Mark suppressed his own name, whilst telling a story which he had the best means of knowing. Awakened out of sleep, or just preparing for it in some house in the valley of Kedron, he comes out to see the seizure of the betrayed Teacher, known to him and in some degree beloved already. He is so deeply interested in His fate that he follows Him even in his linen robe. His demeanor is such that some of the crowd are about to arrest him; then, fear overcoming shame, he leaves his garment in their hands and flees. We can only say that if the name of Mark is supplied, the narrative receives its most probable explanation."[7]

It was through his cousin Barnabas that Mark was brought in contact with Paul. And when Paul and Barnabas were returning to Antioch, having delivered the offering of the Antiochene Christians

[7] Article "Mark" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

to the church at Jerusalem, Mark accompanied them (Acts 12:25). Not long afterwards Paul and Barnabas went forth on their first missionary journey, in accordance with divine direction, Mark accompanying them as their "minister." In this association with these two great missionaries Mark's office probably had reference to temporal rather than spiritual duties. It may have been his business to provide for the needs of the others, arranging all matters connected with their traveling and such like. But when the band came to Perga in Pamphylia, Mark left them and returned to Jerusalem. This departure of Mark must have caused some little trouble and annoyance to the missionaries. And when the same two workers were about to go forth on their second missionary journey, "Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who had departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work." And so sharp did this contention become that the missionaries parted company, each one taking the man of his own choice.

What was the cause of this defection of Mark? Two different answers have been suggested for this question. It has been noted that Mark's family lived in comfortable circumstances in Jerusalem. When Mark accompanied Paul and Barnabas, he had to leave the comforts of that home behind him; but in his new zeal he may not have thought much of the sacrifice he was making. And with no less enthusiasm he must have gone forth with the missionaries on their first journey, probably also feeling

highly honored that he was the person chosen to accompany them as their minister. But the "romance of missions" soon wore off. He found the life of the missionary attended with discomfort and danger, and so by the time he had reached Perga he had had enough of it. Homesickness overcame him, and he went home to Jerusalem. The other explanation that has been offered is that Mark was not prepared to go the lengths in preaching among the Gentiles that Paul and Barnabas advocated. Tinctured with Judaic-Christian feelings, he could not accept and endorse the idea of a universal offer of salvation conditioned on faith alone. Which of these ideas is correct cannot be absolutely decided. It is possible that the truth lies in a combination of the two.

After this incident we do not meet the name of Mark in the Acts again, but both Paul and Peter refer to him afterwards in some of their letters. From the reference to him by Paul, it appears that he had in some way won back the regard and confidence of that great Apostle, and had become profitable to him for the ministry (2 Tim. 4 : 11). Mark was with Paul during a part of the first Roman imprisonment (Col. 4 : 10; Philemon 24). When the Apostle wrote his Epistle to the Colossians in 62 A. D., Mark was planning for a journey to Asia Minor, for Paul writes, "If he come unto you receive him." And when Paul wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy in 67 A. D., Mark was in Asia Minor not far from Timothy, for Paul enjoins Timothy, "Take Mark, and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry."

Turning now to Peter, we find that Mark was with him

in 64 A. D., when he wrote his First Epistle from Babylon. It is evident that Mark, having gone to Asia Minor as he contemplated in 62 A. D., continued his journey and joined Peter at Babylon. When Paul wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy, Mark had returned to Asia Minor and was somewhere in the neighborhood of Ephesus, hence Paul's injunction to Timothy to bring him with him to Rome. There is no possibility of telling how much of the time between 63 and 67 A. D. was spent by Mark in the company of Peter.

Tradition busies itself with the name of Mark, but of all it reports we cannot tell what to accept and what to reject. Among other things it is said that Mark was sent by Peter to Egypt. Jerome tells us that he founded the church at Alexandria, Egypt, and afterwards became its bishop. His death was a violent one, and his tomb became an object of veneration. It is said also that in the year 815 A. D., some Venetian sailors stole his relics, and took them to Venice, where they were buried under the site of the stately cathedral that bears the name of Mark, and thus he became the patron saint of the Venetian Republic.

III. The Purpose of this Gospel.

The purpose of this Evangelist was evidently to portray the life of Christ on its human side. In accordance with this purpose he deals rather with the facts of the life of the Saviour than with His teachings. This memoir of Jesus tells us "how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil;

for God was with Him" (Acts 10 : 38). "The man Christ Jesus is the sole and unchanging theme of the whole book." And if 2 Peter 1 : 15 was the promise of a Gospel record, and if this Gospel was the fulfillment of that promise, we naturally look for a setting forth of the facts of the Gospel history in it. And that is exactly what we do find in it.

As to the persons for whom it was primarily intended, we are safe in affirming that they were Gentiles and not Jews. Jewish rites and ceremonies are always explained whenever the author refers to them. And this is also true of the locations that are described, for they are specified in such a way that it is evident that the writer has in mind persons who were outside of Judea, and who were not personally acquainted with that country. Tradition affirms that Mark wrote his Gospel for the Romans. There is little reason for doubting that Mark wrote this Gospel in Rome. It was natural that he should be influenced largely by the needs of the type of Christians by whom he was surrounded. In its brief, rapid, and concise statement of the facts of the life of Christ, it was peculiarly adapted to the Roman character. The Roman influence on this Gospel is manifest in the presence in it of Latin words. We may conclude, then, that the tradition that it was intended in the first place for Roman Christians is correct, although the Evangelist may have also intended it for a wider sphere than that, writing a Gospel of facts for men of action wherever found. There is no question that from the time of the burning of the city of Rome in 64 A. D., the Christians of that city had been

scattered far and wide by the fierce persecutions of Nero. This would naturally widen the field for this Gospel.

IV. Contents of this Gospel.

I. The work of John the Baptist, preparatory to Christ's Public Ministry. 1 : 1–13.
II. The Galilean Ministry with Capernaum as the center of its operations. 1 : 14–9 : 50.
III. The last journey to Jerusalem. 10 : 1–52.
IV. The closing scenes of Christ's life. 11 : 1–16 : 8.
V. Later addition by another hand than Mark's. 16 : 9–20.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

Rome was unquestionably the place of the composition of this Gospel. The date is not quite so easily settled. It is certain that it was not written before the Epistle to the Colossians, for otherwise Paul would not have referred to Mark simply as the cousin of Barnabas (Col. 4 : 10). On the other hand, it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem (Mark 13 : 13 ff.). This places the time of its composition sometime between 62 and 70 A. D.

Mark is called "the disciple and interpreter of Peter." We are informed by Clement of Alexandria that the Christians of Rome having heard the preaching of Peter, besought Mark to write out the things that were prominent in Peter's preaching. Irenæus tells us that "Matthew wrote a Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching the gospel at Rome and founding a church there. And after their decease (exodus), Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing the things that had been preached by Peter." From this statement, as well as from a careful comparison of this Gospel with the re-

corded speeches and the writings of Peter, it is evident that this Gospel does contain the facts in the life of the Saviour that were made especially prominent by Peter.

In 2 Peter 1 : 15 we read, "Moreover I will endeavor that ye may be able after my decease (exodus) to have these things always in remembrance." Here is a promise by Peter, writes Dr. Warfield, "that he will see to it that his readers shall be in a position after his death to have his teachings always in remembrance, and in this he has especial reference to the facts of Christ's life, witnessed to by him, as is proved by the purpose which he expresses for so arranging, namely, that they may know that they have not followed cunningly devised fables, but facts autoptically witnessed. Surely this seems to promise a Gospel." It is interesting to note that Peter speaks of his decease (Gk. exodus), after which this was to be done; while Irenæus uses the same word in this peculiar sense of death, and tells us that after Peter's and Paul's decease (exodus), Mark delivered, etc. This can be no inadvertent coincidence. Irenæus had Peter's word and promise before him as he wrote, hence he uses this word in this peculiar sense.[8]

If this idea is correct, then, the date of this Gospel

[8] In the account of the Transfiguration as given in Luke 9 : 28 ff., we are informed that when Moses and Elijah talked with Jesus, they "spake of His decease which He should accomplish at Jerusalem." Here the word "exodus" is used, and it was doubtless from this place Peter got this word, for immediately afterwards he speaks of the Transfiguration (2 Peter 1 : 16 f.). Peter wrote with that scene before him, using the word he heard then for death. So Irenæus in all probability had in mind this passage of Peter when he spoke of the circumstances under which Mark wrote his Gospel.

must be placed after that of Second Peter. It is evident that Peter, when he wrote his Second Epistle in 68 A. D., was looking forward to death in a short time. Mark wrote his Gospel accordingly soon afterwards, and consequently we date it during the Summer of 68 A. D.

VI. The Connection between Mark and Peter.

It has already been noted that Mark was called "the disciple and interpreter of Peter." "The character of the Gospel itself coincides with the testimony of antiquity, in inferring a connection between the writer and Peter. Thus we find especial reference to the latter, by the insertion of his name where no reason for it can be discovered in the event related, and where no light is thrown by it on the event itself. His presence is marked in the Gospel, where the recording of it is apparently of no importance, and might have been omitted with equal propriety. Doubtless this peculiarity was owing to a desire, on the part of Mark, to bring out the Apostle into preëminence as his authority, while it evinces an intimate knowledge of the circumstances respecting Peter, unnoticed by the other Evangelists. Examples of this are furnished by chap. 1 : 36, where Simon is mentioned as being with Jesus, a circumstance omitted by Luke. In the account of the raising of Jairus' daughter, Peter, John, and James are mentioned as the only witnesses of the occurrence, whereas in Matthew's Gospel there is no allusion to them (5 : 37)."[9] Other examples of this same feature may be found in 11 : 20–26; 13 : 3; 16 : 7.

[9] Davidson's Introd. 1st Ed., Vol. I., p. 145.

On the other hand it should be noted that Mark omits several references to Peter given by the other Evangelists. The promise made to the Apostles in answer to the question of Peter is unnoticed (Matt. 19:28). And although he was one of the disciples sent to prepare for the observance of the Passover, his name is not given by Mark. The intensity of Peter's repentance is expressed by the word "bitterly" in Matthew and Luke, but this word is omitted by Mark. "It has been sought to account for these omissions on the ground of humility; but some may think that this cannot be the clew in all places. But what we generalize from these passages is, that the name of Peter is peculiarly dealt with, added here, and there withdrawn, which would be explained if the writer had special information about Peter. On the whole the internal evidence inclines us to accept the account that this inspired Gospel has some connection with Peter, and records more exactly the preaching which he, guided by the Spirit of God, uttered for the instruction of the world."

VII. The Integrity of this Gospel.

A very interesting question comes up in regard to the last twelve verses of the last chapter. Did Mark write these verses? The bulk of scholarship[10] has decided this question in the negative. They "are generally regarded as an appendix by an unknown hand. The best textual critics reject them. They are not found in the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts. The internal

[10] Tregelles, Meyer, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Warfield and others.

evidence is strongly against their reception. The repetition of 'early' (ver. 9, cf. vr. 2) is needless; the word for 'week' is never elsewhere used by Mark. The addition 'out of whom He cast seven devils,' to Mary Magdalene's name is quite unaccountable, as she has been already named in this chapter as well as previously in the Gospel; 'the Lord' occurs twice in these verses, never elsewhere in Mark; other words and constructions occurring in this passage are unknown to Mark. The promises made to believers and the general character of the paragraph are suspicious."

It is true that to end this Gospel at 16:8 is very abrupt, but this disputed section does not remedy this abruptness very much. The Revisers of the New Testament show plainly that they regarded the passage with suspicion, for they have separated it somewhat from the preceding text. Why the work of Mark was left thus unfinished, we cannot tell. "We can only say that the termination has been somehow tampered with, and that the difficulties connected with it have not yet been satisfactorily solved." It is not altogether improbable that Mark was compelled to flee from Rome, leaving his Gospel in this unfinished condition.

VIII. The Peculiarities of this Gospel.

This is peculiarly the Gospel of fact and action. It does not deal with the words of Christ, so much as with His actions. It does not contain any long discourses of the Saviour. The style is abrupt, and it seems at times as though the writer could not hasten along fast enough.

The Greek particle translated "forthwith," or "immediately," or "straightway," is used over forty times. The other Evangelists make their transitions more easily, but Mark with an "immediately" dashes on to relate some other event in the wonderful life of the man Christ Jesus. Mark unfolds the truth more in acts than in words. He "frames a series of pictures."

Another characteristic is the way in which Mark at times dwells upon little particulars,—as with a stroke of the pen he gives us a word picture of some action or look of the Saviour,—and thus gives us a new insight into the gracious manner of Christ. "At one time we find a minute touch which places the whole scene before us; at another an accessory circumstance, such as often fixes itself on the mind without appearing at the first sight to possess any special interest. Now there is a phrase which reveals the feeling of those who were the witnesses of some mighty work; now a word which preserves some trait of the Saviour's tenderness or some expressive turn of His language."[11] Dr. J. P. Lange writes,[12] "From the pages of Mark we gather how, at the time, Jesus touched every chord of feeling in the souls of the people — amazement, fear, confidence, hope, joy, delight; and He adapted His power to the varying states of emotion, whether by reproof, healing, or sanctification. The rapidity with which the Saviour achieved such immense results; the impetuous enthusiasm which characterized that day's work in which He pervaded the world with

[11] Westcott's Introd. to the Study of the Gospels, p. 365.

[12] Lange's Commentary on Mark. Introd.

the power and efficacy of His name; and the victorious strength with which He triumphed over the bondage of the world and the sorrows of the grave, and rose to the throne of glory, are here represented as the grand characteristics of the Divine Redeemer, who accomplishes His work of redemption by a series of rapid victories."

Mark unrolls the short public ministry of our Lord in a series of bold life-pictures given in rapid succession. He begins with the ministry of John the Baptist. He takes no time to explain and reveal the inside. He dwells on the outward aspect of that wonderful Personality as it struck the multitude.

III. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE.

I. Canonicity.

We do not find any certain quotations from this book in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, although some think that there are echoes of its language in Clement of Rome (96), Barnabas (106), and Hermas (140–150). Of these, however, there is room for doubt. When we come to Marcion (130) we find ourselves on solid ground. Marcion was a heretic, who was intense in his opposition to anything Jewish. He summarily rejected the Old Testament, and formed a Canon of his own. Into this Canon he admitted ten of the Pauline Epistles, since he regarded Paul as the only true Apostle, as well as a Gospel which he called the "Gospel of Christ." It is now generally admitted that this Gospel was none other than a mutilated Luke. He altered Luke in such a way as to suit his own peculiar heretical notions. According to Ter-

tullian, Cerdon, the teacher of Marcion, was acquainted with this book. Of Justin Martyr's (145) use of Luke there can be no question. Celsus, the great opponent of Christianity, made use of Luke in his attacks upon the Christian faith. Tatian's harmony (150–170) in Syriac included it, and it likewise was in the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions. The Muratori Canon (170) names it as the "third book of the Gospel." The heretics Valentinus (140) and Heracleon (150) used it also. And all the writers of the last quarter of the second century repeatedly quote it by name, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. This evidence is absolutely incontrovertible. There are in all sixteen witnesses distributed all over the Church, who before the end of the second century, testify either directly or indirectly to the existence and use of Luke in the Church as authoritative Scripture.

II. Authorship.

There is but one person whose name is mentioned in the early Church as the author of this Gospel, and that is "Luke the beloved physician." The author nowhere mentions his own name, although he refers to himself in the prefatory words of this Gospel (1 : 3). The Muratori Canon informs us in regard to this book, saying, "The third book of the Gospel, that according to Luke, the well-known physician. Luke wrote in his own name in order after the ascension of Christ, and when Paul had associated him with himself as one studious of right. Nor did he himself see the Lord in the flesh ; and he, according as he was able to accomplish it, began his narrative

with the nativity of John." The fact that Marcion made this Gospel the foundation of his own Gospel presupposes that he regarded it as the work of a disciple of Paul, because of the other fact that he regarded Paul as the only true Apostle.

Luke was a Gentile, for in Col. 4 : 11, 14, he is contrasted with the Jewish Christians. Tradition affirms that he was a native of Syrian Antioch. He was a physician (Col. 4 : 14), and this fact is borne out by the scientific way in which he refers to diseases. "We recognize the physician by the minute accuracy with which he describes certain diseases, and find, from other remarks, that the physician was at the same time an excellent psychologist. 4 : 38 ; 22 : 43, 44, 51, may be cited as proofs of the former ; while in 9 : 54–61 ; 18 : 34 ; 23 : 12 ; 24 : 41, we find significant hints of his insight into the mysteries of human nature."[13] Godet writes : "The circumstance that his profession was that of *a physician* is not unimportant ; for it implies that he must have possessed a certain amount of scientific knowledge, and belonged to the class of educated men. There existed at Rome in the time of the Emperors a medical supervision ; a superior college was charged with the duty of examining in every city those who desired to practice the healing art. Newly admitted men were placed under the direction of older physicians ; their methods of treatment were strictly scrutinized and their mistakes severely punished, sometimes by taking away their diploma. For these reasons, Luke must have possessed an amount of scientific and literary culture

[13] Van Oosterzee in the Lange Commentary on Luke. See also Hobart's Medical Language of St. Luke.

above that of most of the other Evangelists and Apostles."[14]

Luke's name appears but three times in all in the New Testament (Col. 4 : 14 ; Philemon 24 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 11). Assuming what is now generally admitted, that Luke wrote the Acts, we can from that book add materially to our stock of knowledge concerning the man. At Acts 16 : 10 the author of that book became a companion of Paul on the second missionary journey. It is evident from the way in which he thus joined the missionaries at Troas, that he had been a Christian for some time. As already noted, tradition makes Luke a native of Syrian Antioch, and it may be that it was there he became acquainted with Paul, possibly was a convert of his. The sickness that had detained Paul in Galatia (Gal. 4 : 13) had occurred shortly before reaching Troas, and it may have been because of the Apostle's need of medical attendance that Luke became associated with him as a member of the missionary band. From Troas they went to Philippi, where Luke remained until Paul returned there on his third missionary journey. A very early tradition identifies Luke with "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout the churches" (2 Cor. 8 : 18). If this tradition is correct, although we cannot absolutely affirm it to be so, Luke accompanied Titus when he carried the Second Epistle to Corinth. From Philippi Luke accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, and he describes that journey for us in Acts 20 : 5 to 21 : 18. Then came the two tedious years of the Cæsarean imprisonment, during which time Luke probably wrote his Gospel by the side of Paul, and

[14] Godet's Commentary on Luke, Vol. I., p. 17.

somewhat under his direction. The Evangelist was a companion of Paul on the eventful journey to Rome, and from that time until the end of the great Apostle's career, except during temporary absences when called away in the service of the Master, he doubtless remained with Paul, faithfully and heroically sharing his sufferings and trials.

Luke disclaims having been an eye-witness of the life of Christ (1 : 2). The tradition that he was one of the seventy sent out by the Saviour is unquestionably negatived by his own plain statement. It has been inferred by some that Luke had been a slave. It seems that frequently slaves were educated in the medical profession, so as to be able to minister to the needs of their masters. In accordance with this custom, it has been thought that Luke might have been the slave of Theophilus, for whose benefit this Gospel was primarily written. This, however, is all conjecture, and may or may not be true. The higher character of Luke's style compared with that of the other writers of the New Testament, as well as his exact knowledge of contemporary history evinced in his historical references, show that he was a man of no mean intellectual attainments. By many ties was he bound to Paul, who calls him "the beloved physician," and his fellow-laborer. There is something pathetic in the way in which Paul informs Timothy "only Luke is with me." Thus not only had Luke the intellectual qualifications for being an Evangelist, but he also had those peculiar qualities of heart that fitted him for his position by the side of Paul. His constancy and devotion are remarkable, and show how completely he had laid all the powers he possessed on the altar of the Lord's service.

III. The Sources of this Gospel.

Luke has well been called the father of Christian church history. We have already noted the fact that he was not himself an eye-witness of the facts of the Gospel history. He informs us that the sources of his information were two-fold, namely, numerous fragmentary written records that were in existence, and the testimony of eye-witnesses. "Many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us" (1 : 1). These words affirm that already before he wrote, the attempt had been made by many persons to write out an orderly statement of the incidents of the Gospel history. Luke does not belittle these written records at all, but simply states the fact that there were such writings. These he had carefully collected as far as he was able. Then in addition to these, he had used the advantages he had of consulting those who "from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word." Among these latter we must believe was Paul, who was able to give the Evangelist a great deal of information. From these sources Luke compiled his Gospel. Nor can we suppose that the promised inspiration of the Spirit was lacking in his case. Thus with true historical instinct he tested the sources of his information, and, guided by the Holy Spirit, he wrote in an orderly manner that Theophilus might know the certainty of those things, wherein he had been instructed.

Believing that Luke wrote this book at Cæsarea, I think that to the careful observer, there are traces of his having used his opportunities of thoroughly

acquainting himself with the things he relates, as well as the places he describes. It is not at all probable that he had Matthew's Gospel before him as he wrote, or that he had it at all in mind when he refers to the accounts of events in the life of Christ that had been written. There are too many points of dissimilarity between Matthew and this Gospel to allow us to think that he was acquainted with the First Gospel. And had Paul exercised the influence over Luke that the early writers affirm, it seems certain that he would have made some statement of that fact in his preface. "The language of the preface is against the notion of any exclusive influence of St. Paul. The Evangelist, a man on whom the Spirit of God was, made the history of the Saviour's life the subject of research, and with the materials so obtained wrote, under the guidance of the Spirit that was on him, the history now before us."[15] At the same time the general influence of Pauline thought is evident throughout, in his conception of the scope of the Gospel of Christ. Thus with true historical instinct, and under the divine guidance of the Spirit, Luke wrote his Gospel.

IV. The Object of this Gospel.

The object Luke had in writing this book is clearly set forth by him in his prefatory words. He writes, "It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed."

[15] Abbot on "Luke" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

He aims to set forth the historical foundations of the faith in which Theophilus believed. For this reason he selected his material with the needs of this man in view. He designed to make prominent the universal scope of the Gospel, presenting those aspects of His work that were best calculated to strengthen the faith of Theophilus, as well as of that class of persons whom he represents, namely, the Greeks.

V. For Whom Written.

This was primarily for Theophilus, of whom we know absolutely nothing except that he was a Christian, and also probably a man of rank, as indicated by the address, "most excellent Theophilus." "Manifestly the Third Gospel was immediately addressed to the same Theophilus (Luke 1 : 3) to whom the Acts of the Apostles was addressed (Acts 1 : 1). The name is Greek, meaning *lover of God*. Who he was can only be conjectured. Some have supposed from the meaning of the name, that it was used, not to represent any particular person, but Christians in general; others have concluded that he was an honored Greek with whom the Evangelist had been at some time intimately associated; while most have agreed that he was only the representative of a large class to whom the Gospel had been preached, and with whom Luke, under the influence of the Holy Ghost, desired to leave it as a permanent treasure."[16]

That Theophilus was an existing person must be acknowledged. And the way in which Luke describes the places referred to in his Gospel, as well as in the

[16] Gregory's Why Four Gospels, p. 207.

Acts, makes it evident that Theophilus was neither an inhabitant of Palestine, nor of Asia Minor, nor of Greece. But when he refers to places in Italy (Acts 27 : 8, 12, 26) these minute descriptions are omitted. From this it has been inferred, and doubtless correctly, that Theophilus "was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome." But it is also to be noted that the Church Fathers, such as Irenæus, Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, and others, affirm that Luke wrote for the Greeks. This idea is not necessarily in conflict with the address of the preface, if we regard Theophilus as a representative man. The missionary work of Paul was almost exclusively among Greek speaking people, and it was natural that Luke, because of his relation to the great Apostle, and under the influence of Pauline thought, should compose his Gospel with the needs of the Greeks in mind, although addressing it for personal reasons to an individual person. His Gospel "was substantially that which he and Paul had proclaimed to the Greek world ; it was produced and published among Greek peoples ; and while addressed formally to Theophilus, it was really written for the Greeks as representing the Gentile world, and suited to commend Jesus to them as their Saviour."[17] A close examination of the leading features of this book fully bears out this idea.

VI. The Contents of this Gospel.

I. Prefatory Introduction. 1 : 1–4.

II. An account of the time preceding Christ's public ministry, giving matter not found in the other Gospels. 1 : 5–2 : 52.

[17] Gregory's Why Four Gospels, p. 210.

III. The Galilean Ministry, in which is to be found much matter in common with Matthew and Mark. 3 : 1–9 : 50.

IV. The Last Journeys to Jerusalem, giving matter principally peculiar to Luke alone. 9 : 51–18 : 14.

V. History of events relating to the sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Saviour. 18 : 15–24 : 53.

VII. The Date and Place of Composition.

In the Acts Luke refers to this book as "the former treatise," and consequently it was written first. The Acts was written at the close of the two years' imprisonment of Paul in Rome, and before the Apostle's release, that is, in 63 A. D. The probable date of the composition of the Gospel was between 58 and 60 A. D., that is, during the Cæsarean imprisonment. While it is impossible to affirm absolutely, yet Cæsarea was probably the place of its composition. We cannot separate the Gospel and the Acts very much in time, and accordingly we give the above date as the limits of the time in which the Gospel was written.

VIII. The Relation of Luke to Paul.

This has already been touched upon. We do not know when or where these two men first came in contact with each other. There can be no doubt but that they had been friends for some time when Luke joined the missionary band at Troas (Acts 16 : 10). And as the time passed by they became more closely bound together by those ties that bind such men to one another. Relinquishing all the

prospects of advancement and wealth that the practice of his profession might have secured for him, he, like Paul, was content to spend his life in the service of the Master. His Gospel, which has been entitled the "Gospel of free salvation to all men," presents the predominant features of the Pauline theology, which emphasizes the gratuitousness and universalness of salvation. Some have thought that Paul when he speaks of "my Gospel" (Rom. 2 : 16; 16 : 25; 2 Tim. 2 : 8), refers to this Gospel, but it is far more probable that Paul meant the phase of the Gospel of Christ which he made prominent in his preaching, and which he dwells upon particularly in the Epistle to the Ephesians. But at the same time that expression very fittingly describes this Gospel. While rejecting the idea that Luke was practically only the amanuensis of Paul in writing this Gospel, and holding that Luke was truly an independent writer, I still believe with Davidson that "the mind of the Evangelist was impregnated with the views and phraseology of Paul." The account of the institution of the Lord's Supper as given by Luke and Paul (Luke 22 : 19, 20; 1 Cor. 11 : 24, 25) are almost verbally identical. "They are equally fond of words which characterize the freedom and universal destination of the Gospel salvation. They have many terms in common which occur nowhere else in the New Testament. And they often meet in thought and expression in a way which shows both the close intimacy and the mutual dependence of the two writers."[18]

[18] Schaff's History of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 667.

IX. The Peculiarities of this Gospel.

Matthew begins his Gospel with the birth of Christ; Mark with the ministry of John the Baptist; while Luke goes back to the circumstances preceding the birth of John. He presents Christ as the Saviour of mankind. In the genealogical table (3:23–38) he traces the *natural* parentage of Jesus through Mary to Adam, and to God. In this way he "presents Christ as the Son of man, the partaker of a common humanity with man, and, therefore, the kinsman Redeemer of the human family, without respect to national distinctions or the ancient separation of Jews and Gentiles — the author of a common salvation for lost sinners everywhere — the Saviour of the world." He portrays for us the human growth of the Saviour, "pointing out to us successively 'the fruit of the womb' (1:42), the 'babe' (2:16), the 'child' (2:27), the 'boy' (2:40), the 'man' (3:22)."

Luke records a great many things about the life of Christ that are not found in the other Synoptists. His Gospel contains more history than either Matthew or Mark, having 38 sections, or 541 verses peculiar to himself, while Matthew has but 17 sections peculiar to himself, and Mark only 2. As Luke has 93 sections in all, it is evident that more than one third of them are not paralleled in Matthew or Mark. This fact alone overturns the idea of his being dependent on either of them for any of his matter. And it is also to be noted that there is evidence of the dependence of Mark 16:9–20 on the corresponding part of Luke. Luke is also the best writer of

Greek in the New Testament. His vocabulary is larger than that of any of the other writers.[19] In his Gospel he has 55 words, and in the Acts 135 words that occur nowhere else in the New Testament. The first two chapters are strongly tinged with Hebraisms, doubtless due to the sources from which they were obtained. Luke records thirteen parables and seven miracles not found in the other Gospels. He also furnishes the words for the grandest hymns of the Church, namely: the "Ave Maria" (1:28), the "Magnificat" (1:46), the "Benedictus" (1:68), the "Gloria in Excelsis" (2:14), the "Nunc Dimittis" (2:29).

Another marked feature of this book is its numerous references to contemporaneous history. To it more than to any other are we indebted for the data upon which it is possible to fix the dates of some of the important events of the Gospel history. He refers to the members of the Herodian family, the emperors Augustus and Tiberius, the census under the Syrian governor Quirinius. The most careful and critical investigation has been made of all these references of the Evangelist, with the result of demonstrating the true historical character of his writings.

Canon Farrar writes of this Gospel that it "is the Gospel not only of children and of the Gentiles, and of the humble and the despised, of the blind, the lame, the halt, the maimed, but even of the publican and the harlot, the prodigal and the outcast; not only of Mary, but of the Magdalene; not only of

[19] For further examination of the comparisons and contrasts, see Schaff's History, Westcott's Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, etc.

Zacchæus, but of the dying thief." It is the Gospel that presents Jesus as the Saviour of the world.

IV. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN.

I. Canonicity.

In regard to the use of this Gospel by the Apostolic Fathers, the words of Professor Warfield may be quoted: "To take them up one by one we may say: First, that Polycarp (116) has no direct quotations from St. John's Gospel, which indeed, considering the briefness and general character of his letter, is not surprising. But he has a clear reference to John's First Epistle; and this implies the Gospel. Whoever wrote one wrote both; nay, wrote both at the same time, and sent them forth together. To witness to one implies, therefore, a witness to both. Barnabas (106) again has no direct quotations from St. John; and his evidence rests on his use of John's vocabulary and his reiteration of John's theology. Clement (96) does not seem to quote John, although there are some very noticeable coincidences of language with First John. For direct quotations of John's Gospel we are thrown back thus on Ignatius (115); and he supplies them to us."[20] The Epistle to Diognetus (117) clearly refers to John 3:16. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (115) evinces an unmistakable correspondence of ideas and words with John. "The eucharistic prayers of the Teaching breathe a Johannean atmosphere."[21] The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120) repeatedly echoes John. Papias (120–130) clearly used First John, and,

[20] Syllabus on the Canon, printed for his students, p. 34.

[21] Schaff's Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, p. 90.

according to Irenæus, he also quotes the Gospel. Among the heretics, Basilides (125) used it; Marcion (130), according to Tertullian, rejected Matthew and John, a fact which implies their apostolic authority; Valentinus (140) also used it; Heracleon (150) wrote a commentary on it, which Origen quotes; the Ophites ascribed scriptural authority to it; and the Naassenes and Peratici used it. The use of it by Justin Martyr (145) has been settled beyond all possibility of doubt.[22] Tatian (150–170) verbally quotes 1:5 and 4:24, the former of which he introduces with the words, "That which was spoken," proving that he regarded it as Scripture: while his Harmony included it, beginning with the opening words of this Gospel. Jerome informs us that Theophilus of Antioch (168–182) composed a work, comparing the four Gospels together, a fact that implies the recognition of John by the Church at large. Among other witnesses to be summoned in favor of this Gospel are Hermas (140–150), Melito of Sardis (170), Apollinaris (175), Athenagoras (177), the Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (177), the Muratori Canon (170), the Syriac (160), and Old Latin (170) Versions. By Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, the great writers of the last quarter of the second century, it is freely used and quoted by name.

There are in all at least nineteen witnesses to the use and recognition of John before the end of the second century. And against all these there is only one voice to be cited, and that of an insignificant little heretical sect, known as the Alogi, who rejected it because of the conflict of 1:1 with their peculiar

[22] Abbot's Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

ideas. Bleek writes: "My conviction at least is that an unprejudiced consideration of the external testimonies leads to the certain conclusion that our Fourth Gospel was recognized as a trustworthy authority and a genuine work in the various churches of Christendom before the middle of the second century." And the same writer, referring to the second century controversies, adds: "The position which the contending parties in all these controversies allowed to our Gospel can be historically explained only on the supposition that it was known and recognized as genuine in the Church at large some decades of years before the middle of the second century, if not from the very beginning of it: and this fact in turn can only be explained upon the supposition that it is a genuine and apostolic work."[23] Olshausen affirms that "the Gospel of John possesses stronger testimony with respect to its genuineness than perhaps any other writing in the New Testament, or, we may say, of the whole of antiquity."[24]

But no book has been as persistently assailed by rationalistic criticism as this one. No doubts about it were expressed until 1820 A. D., when the first assaults were made upon it. The Johannean question is a life and death question between conservative and destructive criticism. "The vindication of the Fourth Gospel as a genuine product of John, the beloved disciple, is the death blow of the mythical and legendary reconstruction and destruction of the life of Christ and the apostolic history." Rationalistic criticism has boldly proclaimed but a

[23] Bleek's Introd. to the N. T., Vol. I., p. 250.

[24] Olshausen on the Gospels, Vol. III., p. 171.

few years ago that we must date this book at not earlier than 160 A. D. But this verdict of rationalism has been triumphantly answered by a believing criticism, which has repeatedly vindicated the earlier date it claims. Dr. Sanday has but lately written that it is a "serious matter for the consideration of the opponents of this Gospel," that "we are getting perilously near St. John's time, and the gap is unexpectedly filling up." The same writer concludes, "If the inquiries which are now in progress should have the result which it seems very possible they may have, three consequences will follow: (1) The view which places the composition of the Gospel in the second century will be clearly untenable; (2) it will be established that the Gospel had its origin in some leading Christian circle at the time and place which tradition assigns to it; (3) it will be increasingly probable that its author was St. John."[25] And we may conclude this section by the affirmation that despite the determined assaults of its enemies, there never has been a time when we could feel more confident than now, that this Gospel was truly the product of the pen of John, and that its canonical authority has been acknowledged by the Church in all ages.[26]

II. The Authorship of this Gospel.

The voice of the early Church, as soon as it begins to express an opinion on this subject, is unanimous

[25] Sanday in the Expositor, Dec., 1891, p. 419.

[26] On this whole subject see especially Abbot's Authorship of the Fourth Gospel; Bishop Lightfoot in the Expositor, 4th Series, Vol. I.; Gloag's Johannine Writings, Sanday in the Expositor, 4th Series, Vol. IV.; Godet's, Westcott's, Meyer's Commentaries on John.

in asserting that it proceeded from the pen of John, the beloved disciple. But turning to the *internal* evidence of the book on this subject, we will find that there is little reason for doubting the correctness of this opinion of the Church.

(1.) The author of this book was a Jew. This is proven by the fact that the author is thoroughly conversant not only with the Old Testament, but also with Jewish usages and opinions. While the book was written in Greek, it is thoroughly Hebraistic in its general style. "The Hebraism comes out less in the vocabulary than in the construction of the sentences, the fondness for parallel clauses, the frequent repetition of the same thought, with slight modifications of sense and form, the simple modes of conjunction, the absence of complicated periods."[27]

(2.) The author was a Palestinian Jew. He evinces the most intimate acquaintance with the historical and geographical relations of the country. The book abounds in vividness and directness of descriptions, as well as in individual details in regard to the places referred to. Renan says of 4:1-38, that "only a Jew of Palestine who had often passed the entrance of the valley of Sichem could have written that." His descriptions show that he had personally been over the ground, evincing a minute acquaintance with the localities mentioned. "He knows thoroughly the localities of Jerusalem and of the Temple, as, for example, the pool of Bethesda by the sheep gate, with its five porches; the pool of Siloam; Solomon's porch, and the treasury in the Temple; the brook Kedron; the place of a skull,

[27] Sanday's Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, p. 28.

called Golgotha; and Joseph's sepulchre in the garden."[28]

(3.) The author was also an eye-witness of the events he describes (1:29, 35–40; 2:1; 5:7; 8:20; 9:1–7; 10:20; 18:1, et passim).[29] Indeed, he expressly claims this (1:14; 1st John 1:1–4). The minute details in which he frequently indulges are the graphic descriptions of one who witnessed personally the facts he relates.

(4.) He was an Apostle. This is borne out by the fact that only one who belonged to the inner circle of the disciples could have been a witness of the things he graphically relates. "He initiates us into the peculiar relations which Jesus maintained with each one of them, and especially loves to recall the striking words in which their characters or secret thoughts disclose themselves."[30] (1:38–50; 4:31–38; 6:5–9, 70; 9:2; 11:16; 12:21, 22; 13:6–9, 23–25, 27–30; 14:5, 8, 22; 16:17, 18, 29, 30; 18:16; 20:3–8, 28.)

Now to whom do these descriptions apply but to John? The author must have been one of the favored three, but certainly he could not have been either Peter or James. He could only have been John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved." And that it was he, is also borne out by the way in which he refers to the Baptist. He never says John the Baptist, as the Synoptists do, for he does not feel the need of distinguishing himself from the forerunner of the Saviour. Thus while he holds back his own name,

[28] Gloag's Johannine Writings, p. 118.

[29] Godet on John, Vol. I., p. 103 ff.

[30] Godet, ib., p. 254.

his personality is manifest throughout. There is a tacit claim that he is John the Apostle. Baur coolly informs us that the design of the author was evidently to lead the reader to believe that he was the Apostle John, for that was who he was. Bleek says, "Our investigation has confirmed us in the steadfast conviction, which is unavoidably urged upon us ever and anon from different considerations, that this Fourth Gospel is really the work of St. John, the trusted and beloved disciple of the Lord." Dr. Schaff also writes, "A review of the array of testimonies, external and internal, drives us to the irresistible conclusion that the Fourth Gospel is the work of John the Apostle. This view is clear, self-consistent and in full harmony with the character of the book and the whole history of the apostolic age; while the hypothesis of a literary fiction and pious fraud is contradictory, absurd, and self-condemned. No writer in the second century could have produced such a marvelous book, which towers high above all the books of Justin Martyr and Irenæus and Tertullian and Clement and Origen, or any father or schoolman or reformer. No writer in the first century could have written it but an Apostle, and no Apostle but John, and John himself could not have written it without divine inspiration."[31]

John's parents were Zebedee (Mark 1:19) and Salome (Mark 15:40 cf. Matt. 27:56). Their circumstances in life were comfortable. Zebedee had hired servants (Mark 1:20), and also partners in his business as a fisherman (Luke 5:10); his wife Salome was one of the women who ministered to the Saviour

[31] Schaff's History of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 714.

of their substance (Luke 8 : 3), and went to the sepulchre prepared to embalm His body (Mark 16 : 1); and John himself owned a home (John 19 : 27). John doubtless had a good common education, judging from his writings, although he had received no special rabbinical instruction (Acts 4 : 13). He was first a disciple of the Baptist, by whom he was directed to the Saviour (1 : 29–40). With Andrew he followed Christ thus pointed out, and after their interview with Him, they were firmly convinced of His Messiahship. John thus became one of the first two disciples of Jesus. His own personal qualifications not only secured for him a place in the apostolate, but also in the inner circle of the Apostles with Peter and James. These three disciples were peculiarly favored, and were brought into the most intimate relations with the Master. John remained closely with Jesus after his call to the apostolate, and was admitted to closer relations to Him than any of the others. He was the disciple whom Jesus loved and at the last Supper he was accorded the place of honor next to Jesus, that of leaning on His bosom. And passing by His own brothers, the Saviour, as He hung upon the cross, showed His supreme confidence in the beloved disciple, by committing to his care His mother.

After the Ascension, John and Peter were the most prominent characters among the disciples. John was one of the three pillars of the church at Jerusalem, who gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul as the Apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. 2 : 9). He was "the faithful colleague and wise counselor" of Peter in the days when he was founding the Church. We

have no means of telling just when John left Jerusalem, but that he did remove to Ephesus, and there became the commanding personality in the church of that region for the last quarter of the first century is abundantly proven by tradition. Bishop Lightfoot writes, "At length the hidden fires of his nature burst into a flame. When St. Peter and St. Paul have ended their labors, the more active career of St. John is just beginning. If it has been their task to organize and extend the church, to remove her barriers, and to advance her liberties, it is his special province to build up and complete her theology. The most probable chronology makes his withdrawal from Palestine to Asia Minor coincide very nearly with the martyrdom of these two Apostles, who have guided the church through her first storms and led her to her earliest victories. This epoch divides his life into two distinct periods. Hitherto he has lived as a Jew among Jews; henceforth he will be as a Gentile among Gentiles. The writings of St. John in the canon probably mark the close of each period. The Apocalypse winds up his career in the church of the circumcision; the Gospel and the Epistles are the crowning result of a long residence in the heart of Gentile Christendom." [32]

That the Ephesian residence was broken into by John's exile to Patmos is clear. This probably occurred during the reign of Domitian. Tradition has many things to relate about the residence at Ephesus, among which the most probable are his conflict with the heretic Cerinthus and his reclaiming of the robber chief. Investigations at Ephesus have dis-

[32] Lightfoot on Galatians, p. 198.

covered the probable site of the church in which John must often have preached, as well as the house in which he resided. It is probable that John died a natural death at an advanced age in the last decade of the first century. Tradition says that he was cast into a caldron of boiling oil, but that he was unhurt by it. It is said that he became so feeble that he had to be carried to his beloved church, and could only say in words of heavenly benediction on the assembled Christians, "Little children, love one another." Dean Stanley writes, "We see him — it surely is no unwarranted fancy — we see him declining with the declining century, every sense and faculty waxing feebler, but that one divinest faculty of all burning more and more brightly; we see it through every look and gesture, the one animating principle of the atmosphere in which he lives and moves; earth and heaven, the past, the present, and the future alike echoing to him that dying strain of his latest words, 'We love Him because he first loved us.'"

The personal character of John is most beautiful. It is not a character that was in any sense weak. The name Boanerges given him by the Saviour (Mark 3 : 17) implies the intensity of his nature. His abhorrence of sin was intense, and he could rise to impassioned utterance of the highest type when denouncing it. He was peculiarly bound to the Saviour. The key word of his First Epistle, which was the companion piece to his Gospel, is love. Nor was John's love merely a "soft feeling, but a living principle, an absolute devotion to truth, as he had seen it and known it in the person of his Lord." It

was a love that was the strong and abiding passion of his deep, intuitive nature.

III. For Whom Written.

From very early days it has been held that John wrote his Gospel for the benefit of Christians in general. There is an early tradition that it was at the earnest request of the Christians of Ephesus, that John, as the one best qualified for writing a Gospel, because of the intimate relations he had sustained to Jesus, wrote this book for the instruction and establishment in the faith of Christians everywhere. This is abundantly sustained by the tenor of the whole book. There can be no question but that this apostolic Evangelist had in mind the needs of the Christian world at the close of the first century, as he wrote this Gospel.

IV. The Occasion and Design of this Gospel.

The Apostle tells us plainly why he wrote this Gospel. "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name' (20:30, 31). It is evident from these words that John chiefly designed in his Gospel to bring forth into the clearest light the divinity of Christ. The whole of the book is in keeping with this central design.

Clement of Alexandria informs us that "John, perceiving that the external facts had been made plain in the Gospel (*i. e.*, in the Synoptic Gospels),

being urged by his friends, and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel."[33] The idea of the early Church Fathers is that this Gospel was intended to be supplemental to the other three. This traditionary idea gives, as the occasion of the writing of this book by John, the repeated requests of his fellow Christians, that he, as the one who enjoyed such close relations to Christ, should commit to writing a Gospel that would supplement and fill out the Synoptic Gospels. This supplemental design will account for the fact that he does not traverse the same grounds as the other Evangelists do, but gives a great deal of matter peculiar to himself. But this could not have been the primary design of the Apostle, although it is not excluded by the intention and design he expresses. Another design has been suggested, and that is, that this Gospel is polemical, intended to confute the heretical opinions that were rife in the Church in his day. Both Irenæus and Jerome name Cerinthus, the great heresiarch of Asia Minor, as the one against whom this book was directed. There is no question but that in his First Epistle, which was the practical application of this Gospel, and its companion piece, John aimed to controvert the positions of the early Gnostics. But the same cannot be said of this Gospel. It is true that such terms as "life," "light," and others, that were pet phrases with the Gnostics, are here used, but it can hardly be affirmed that they were used thus with polemical purpose. The Gnostics denied the divinity of Christ, and their denial doubtless in part occasioned this masterly Gospel, that revolves around that great

[33] Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, 6 : 14.

central doctrine; but still the historical purpose is the most prominent. Strong and positive expressions of truth always conflict with error. But this Gospel was meant more to establish the truth than to assail error. Still others insist that the design of John was dogmatic, that he uses his Gospel as the vehicle for communicating his system of theology.

Now none of these three theories are necessarily in conflict with one another; on the contrary, they may all together be true as minor purposes of the Apostle. Still the primary object was really two-fold. "Whilst the other Gospels contain a record of the life of Christ for the information of the Church, the Fourth Gospel is essentially an historical writing composed with an evangelical purpose."[34] Thus John aims, first, to establish Christians in the faith in the divinity of Christ; and, second, by the way of that faith, to enable them to secure life through His name. He designed, then, "to lead men to believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and to enable them to derive spiritual and eternal life through their faith in Him."[35]

V. The Sources of this Gospel.

While John undoubtedly had seen the Synoptic Gospels, we may emphatically affirm that he was dependent on no written sources. He explicitly claims to have been an eye-witness of the events he records, and his whole Gospel has the vividness of one who was relating what he personally had seen and heard. He writes, "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father" (1 : 14).

[34] Gloag's Johannine Writings, p. 155. [35] Ib., p. 157.

And in his First Epistle, he also writes, "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the word of life; (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." (1 John 1 : 1–3.) From these words, it is plain that he drew his material entirely from his own personal knowledge. He informs us that he had omitted many things he might have written (20 : 30). He only recorded as much as was needed for the specific purpose he had in view.

VI. The Contents of this Gospel.

The following outline, given by Dr. Gloag, is admirable: —

The Prologue: the incarnation of the Word, 1 : 1–18.

I. The revelation and ministry of the Son of God to the world.

a. Testimonies borne to Christ: by the Baptist, 1 : 19–34; by the disciples, 1 : 35–51; by His miracles, 2 : 1–12.

b. The ministry of Christ: in Judea, 2 : 13–3 : 36; in Samaria, 4 : 1–42; in Galilee, 4 : 43–54.

c. Christ's self-revelation as the Son of God: in Jerusalem, 5 : 1–47; in Galilee, 6 : 1–7 : 10.

d. Christ's ministry in Jerusalem: at the feast of Tabernacles, 7 : 11–8 : 59; at the feast of Dedication, 9 : 1–10 : 42.

e. Christ's glorification as the Son of God in the resurrection of Lazarus, 11 : 1–57.

f. Close of Christ's public ministry, 12 : 1–50.

II. The revelation and ministry of the Son of God to His disciples.

a. The last discourses of Christ to His disciples, 13 : 1–16 : 33.

b. The sacerdotal prayer, 17 : 1–26.

III. The revelation of the Son of God in His sufferings and resurrection.

a. The last sufferings of Christ, 18 : 1–19 : 42.

b. The resurrection, 20 : 1–31.

The Epilogue.

a. The appearance of the risen Lord at the Sea of Tiberias, 21 : 1–14.

b. The Lord and His two disciples, Peter and John, 21 : 15–25

VII. The Date and Place of Composition.

All early writers declare that John wrote last of all. And in keeping with this are the internal marks of the book itself. The heretical ideas combated in the First Epistle were the ideas that were prevalent at the close of the first century. The dates that various writers suggest range from 70 A. D. to 90 A. D., the majority dating it about 80 A. D. But considering the manifestly close relation that exists between this Gospel and the First Epistle, together with the reasons for as late a date as possible for the latter, I am inclined to date this Gospel at about 90 A. D. John lived until 98 A. D. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt as to the place of composition having been Ephesus. There is no real support for

the idea that it was written on Patmos at the same time as the Apocalypse.

VIII. The Peculiarities of this Gospel.

None of the other Gospels have as strongly marked peculiarities as this one has. In its language it is composed in the simplest Greek. Idiomatic expressions are avoided. There are no involved sentences in it, and there is a very limited use of particles in the construction of its sentences. It is "pure Greek in vocabulary and grammar, but thoroughly Hebrew in temper and spirit, even more so than any other book, and can be almost literally translated into Hebrew without losing its force and beauty."

John alone gives us any information about the early Judean ministry of our Saviour. Were we left to the Synoptists alone for information, we would never certainly know that our Lord's ministry was longer than one year, but John mentions four Passovers (2 : 13 ; 5 : 1 ; 6 : 4 ; 13 : 1). From this we know that His ministry extended over three years. Of the 62 sections in John's Gospel, 32 contain matter not recorded elsewhere. This Apostle preserves for us the most charming of our Lord's discourses. "John gives us an abundance of new matter of great interest and importance. Right at the threshold we are startled as by a peal of thunder from the depths of eternity : 'In the beginning was the Word.' And as we proceed, we hear about the creation of the world, the shining of the true light in darkness, the preparatory revelations, the incarnation of the Word, the testimony of the Baptist to the Lamb of God. We listen with increasing wonder to those mysteri-

ous discourses about the new birth of the Spirit, the water of life, the bread of life from heaven, about the relation of the eternal and only begotten Son to the Father, to the world, and to believers, the mission of the Holy Spirit, the promise of many mansions in heaven, the farewell to the disciples, and at last that sacerdotal prayer which brings us nearest to the throne and the beating heart of God."[36]

This Gospel is the divinest of them all, and has well been called "the heart of Jesus." Schleiermacher has said that it is the Gospel which authenticates itself to the inner perception as the truest portrait of Christ. It presents the Saviour as He appeared to the man whose nature enabled him to come into the most sympathetic touch with Him. No one was better qualified than the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who leaned on His bosom, to place this divine capstone to the four-fold Gospel. His deeply intuitive and keenly perceptive nature gave him an insight into the character of the Lord that none of the rest had. He knew Jesus better than all others did. And because of these facts, there was no other person that could compose a Gospel that was better adapted for the needs of the times in which it was written. There was a danger that in the misty speculations of the latter part of the first century, the real personality and actual existence of Christ should be lost sight of. It was John's task to in a measure restore that fading personality and make Him real to the faith of the world. "It is most instructive and impressive to consider how John, the one most intimate with the Master in His

[36] Schaff's History of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 677.

earthly life, was left to turn the mind of the new generation back to the life that was manifested, and to testify to its reality. The thought of men about Christ had been growing in elevation, as was fitting and right; but it had been growing away from the human life. Even that, perhaps, was for a time best; but now John writes to bring the higher thought to which men's faith had attained, back to the earthly life that they were forgetting, and show them that their highest thought could not overpass the word there uttered, and that the thought was never to be separated from the life."[37]

"With the simplicity in style and diction, and even in the thoughts and sentiments of the Johannine writings, there is combined a real profundity which no human intellect can fathom. The Fourth Gospel is especially remarkable for its depth; it has been well called by the Fathers 'the spiritual Gospel,' as compared with the Synoptical Gospels. It opens the deepest recesses of the spiritual life; it discloses the very heart of the incarnate God; it reveals the Divine human nature which Christ possessed; it lifts the veil and lets us see into the holy of holies. The two preponderating ideas are life and light, and these are embodied in Christ: He is at once the Life and the Light of men, the source of all spiritual life, and the essence of all spiritual truth, the sun of the moral universe. The writings of John may be compared to a well of water, so clear and sparkling that at first one thinks he sees to the bottom; but that well is so deep, that the more one gazes into it, the deeper does it appear, and no one

[37] Professor Porter in the S. S. Times, Jan., 1892.

has yet been able to fathom it."[38] Dr. Storrs writes: "It was an original, self-moulded Gospel, inspired by the Spirit, but dependent on no other. What he wrote came from his own mind, it came with a gush. It is the most profoundly individual book, we may say, in all the Scriptures. It is like the 'seamless garment of the Lord,' one has said, so thoroughly interwoven, so glistening with celestial gold. I should rather say, it is like the sudden gush of the gold, long fused and simmering in the furnace, until all dross has vanished from it, and all impurity has been cleansed away, which, at last, when the door is opened, rushes forth, glowing, incandescent, streaming with light, and precious beyond estimate and compare. So came the Gospel from the heart which had held it so intimately and so long, and which spoke it at last, to be henceforth the inestimable possession of the world forever."[39]

[38] Gloag's Johannine Writings, p. 73.

[39] Lectures on the N. T., Amer. Tr. Soc.

CHAPTER IV.

The Acts of the Apostles.

The title of this book, as thus given, is not strictly accurate, for it is actually occupied with parts of the history of only two of the Apostles, Peter and Paul. When this book was first sent by its author to Theophilus, to whom it is addressed, it doubtless had no title. Its opening words show that the author regarded it as a continuation of the history he had given in the Third Gospel. It is distinguished from that book, which is here called the "former treatise." How early in history the title we now have prefixed to the book, came into existence we cannot tell, but it was probably at a very early date. Codex Vaticanus calls it "Acts of Apostles," and Codex Sinaiticus makes the title still shorter, and briefly names it "Acts."

I. Canonicity.

A historical book such as this is, was not likely to be quoted as often as the Epistles, but still we can find many external testimonies to its early existence and use. Polycarp (116) quotes it. In the Epistle to Diognetus (117) there are coincidences of language more or less marked. Hermas (140–150) has some probable allusions to it. Hegesippus (157–176) "does not formally quote it, but he has forms of expressions corresponding to passages in the Acts

which cannot be attributed to chance." It is named in the Muratori Canon (170). Indisputable resemblances to it are to be found in the Letter from the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (177). The Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions contain it. And Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195) quote it by name. These testimonies are sufficient to show its acceptance from the early days of the Church.

It was rejected, however, by some, but by these for a reason, inasmuch as they were all heretics. Professor Charteris writes, "The Manicheans objected to it because of its account of the coming of the Holy Ghost. The Marcionites could not accept it because of its testimony to the God of Creation being the Father of Christ Jesus. The Ebionites rejected it because of its recording the admission of Gentiles into the Church without circumcision; the Severians would not have Paul's Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles because these books were in conflict with their ascetic principles."[1]

The authenticity of the book is strongly borne out by an examination of the speeches recorded in it. Paley in his *Horæ Paulinæ* has constructed an unanswerable argument in favor of the accuracy of the historical references of the book by comparing them with those of the Pauline Epistles. He proves conclusively that the Acts harmonizes with the Epistles, and he demonstrates the accuracy of the former in its historical allusions to events in the life of Paul. Rationalistic critics have done their utmost to convict the book of inaccuracies and ab-

[1] Charteris' Canonicity, p. 206, note.

solute discrepancies, but they have failed in their efforts. I believe that one certain case of inaccuracy in the statements of the book has yet to be proven. There are undesigned coincidences between the Acts and the Pauline Epistles that certainly demonstrate the authenticity of the former. Davidson writes, "We hesitate not to assert that the idea of the book being fabricated by a later unknown writer, with whatever motive he set about the task, involves the *improbable*, not to say the *impossible* at every step. . . . The wakefulness and talents of the person who palmed the history on his generation as the authentic production of Paul's companion, must have been extraordinary. Not so constructed are the forgeries of that period. They have therefore been detected long ago by the test of fair criticism. But the book of Acts has stood the test unshaken. . . . We are confident that the credibility of the Acts will be universally acknowledged long after the negative criticism has vanished away like every temporary extravagance of unbridled reason, or rather of unbridled scepticism."[2]

II. The Authorship of the Book.

Without a dissenting voice the testimony of the early Church is in favor of the Evangelist Luke, as the author of this book. The book "announces itself as the second work of the same author who wrote the Gospel dedicated to Theophilus. The Acts of the Apostles is therefore justly considered as a portion of the historical work of Luke, following up that Gospel, and continuing the history of

[2] Davidson's Introd., 1st Ed., Vol. II., p. 51.

early Christianity from the ascension of Christ to the captivity of Paul at Rome; and no other but *Luke* is named by the ancient orthodox Church as the author of the book, which is included by Eusebius among the Undisputed Books. . . . So early an ecclesiastical recognition of the canonicity of the book would be inexplicable, if the teachers of the church had not from the very first recognized it as a second work of Luke, to which, as well as to the Gospel, apostolic authority belonged."[3] Bleek writing in regard to the authorship of the two books, says, "Both works not only breathe throughout the same spirit, but exhibit the same phraseology. Now, that the writer was Luke, the friend of Paul, rests as to both the Acts and the Gospel of Luke on ecclesiastical tradition, which we have no just grounds to doubt. It is true Luke is not mentioned as the author till towards the close of the second century, first by Irenæus, and then by Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and others, but then these writers state the fact so unhesitatingly, not even stopping to discuss it, that it is quite clear that they must have known it to be universally acknowledged by the Church in their day, and derived from a still older ecclesiastical tradition. No doubt, from the very first, ever since the works had come before the general public, this had been the common opinion in the Church."[4]

In support of this traditional belief, it being assumed that Luke was the author of the Third Gospel, the following reasons may be urged, namely: (1.) It was the unhesitating and unanimous belief

[3] Meyer on Acts, Introd.

[4] Bleek's N. T. Introd., Vol. I., p. 368.

of the early Church. (2.) The similarity of the inscription, character, and style of this book to the Third Gospel. (3.) The similarity of language between the two books, over fifty words being common to them that are not used elsewhere in the New Testament. (4.) The manifest connection between the two books, this being the continuation of the history given in the Third Gospel.

At Acts 16 : 10 the author became a member of the missionary band, for the narrative continues from that point in the first person plural. Luke consequently joined Paul's company, when the Apostle reached Troas on his second missionary journey. A short time previous to this, Paul had been detained by sickness in Galatia (Gal. 4 : 13), and it is not improbable that Luke became one of the missionary band in order that he as a physician might attend to the needs of the Apostle, recovering from his recent sickness. From Troas they went together to Philippi, and there Luke remained until Paul came again to that city on his third missionary journey about six years later. This is proven by the fact that from 16 : 19 to 20 : 5 the narrative continues in the third person, but at 20 : 5 the first person again appears, indicating that the writer had again joined company with the Apostle. From this point on, these "we-passages" predominate in the narrative.

An effort has been made to prove that the author of these "we-passages" was Timothy or Silas. But in 20 : 4, 5 it is evident that Timothy is distinguished from the writer, while there is no evidence that Silas was ever associated again with the Apostle

after the residence of eighteen months in Corinth from 52 to 53 A. D. If Timothy was the author of these passages, it is hard to understand why they do not begin at 16 : 4, where Timothy became one of the companions of Paul in his missionary work; and there is also need for explaining why the narrative does not continue in the first person at 18 : 5, when Timothy joined Paul at Corinth. On the other hand, there is no real reason why Luke was not the author of these passages himself. Silas and Timothy being ruled out, Luke alone remains as the probable, or even possible author. Desperate efforts have been made by rationalistic critics to place this book much later in history than the time of Luke. Its historicity has been openly assailed by some, and all sorts of sinister motives have been attributed to its assumed compiler of the second century. Some, admitting that Luke may have been the author of the "we-passages," still contend that a later editor brought the book into its present shape. Professor Dods writes, "Those who still maintain that the book was written in the second century are placed in the awkward predicament of being obliged to hold that the skillful literary hand which is discernible throughout, incorporated and re-wrote these sections so clumsily as not even to alter the 'we' of his sources into 'they.' This is too much for literary critics like Renan, who frankly declares that such an explanation is inadmissible, and that although a ruder compiler would have left the 'we' unaltered, it is not possible to ascribe such clumsiness to the writer of *Acts*. 'We are therefore irresistibly led to the conclusion that he who wrote

the latter part of the work wrote also the former, and that the writer of the whole is he who says, "we" in the sections alluded to.'"[5] Meyer says, "The we-narrative, with its vivid and direct impress of personal participation, always remains a strong testimony in favor of a companion of the Apostle as the author of the whole book, of which that narrative is a part; to separate the subject of that narrative from the author of the whole, is a procedure of sceptical caprice."[6]

This book and the Third Gospel stand or fall together. All that has been advanced in favor of the Lucan authorship of that Gospel holds good to prove the same of this book. And so far nothing has been developed that can in any way rob Luke of the honor of having written this book of the Acts, as a continuation of the historical work he had done in the Third Gospel.

III. The Sources of the Book.

In the introductory words to his Gospel, Luke lays down the method of his procedure in compiling the history contained in that book. He had carefully gathered together all available material, whether in the form of short fragmentary written notes, or the oral testimony of eye-witnesses of the events of the Gospel history. This material he had carefully sifted and tested, before he had proceeded to write his memoir of Christ, upon which Theophilus might rely, as he says, "that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." The same plan was doubtless pursued

[5] Dods' N. T. Introd., p. 65. [6] Meyer on Acts, p. 7.

in the composition of this book, with this difference however, that he was an eye-witness himself of a good deal that is recorded in it. That he was dependent on documents for some parts of this work is undeniable when close examination is made. Very probably some of the speeches recorded, especially of Peter, had been committed to writing.

There are 1007 verses in this book. Of these the "we-passages" include 318; while 366 others recount the acts and words of Paul, or scenes which he undoubtedly witnessed, as, *e. g.*, the trial, defense, and death of Stephen. To these we may add the 36 verses (8 : 5–40), which recount the evangelistic tour of Philip, the account of which Luke probably obtained while he was lodging at the house of Philip in Cæsarea (21 : 8–10), as well as the four introductory verses. Adding these up, we can readily see that Luke from his own experience, and from what he could learn from Paul and Philip, could write 724 verses, or over seven-tenths of the whole book, without having recourse to any documents. There remain but 283 verses to be accounted for, and these verses relate the acts and words of Peter, all of which may have been preserved in some written form to which the historian had access. From this, it is evident that the sources of the information contained in the book were written records, oral testimony, and personal knowledge.[7]

Efforts have been made to prove that the book as it stands is not the work of one hand, but at least of two. It is admitted that there are some differ-

[7] The passages for which he was dependent on some other source than Paul and Philip are 1 : 5–6 : 8; 9 : 32–11 : 18; 12 : 1–23.

ences in style between the first part of the book and the latter, but the fact that he was more dependent on documentary sources for the first part than for the latter will in large part account for this. But the vocabulary of words in the two parts is about the same. The Lucan style predominates the whole; so much so, that most scholars pronounce against the idea that Luke did not write both parts.

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Book.

The occasion of the book is very manifest. Luke had composed his Gospel for the instruction of Theophilus, and for the confirmation of his faith, "that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed" (Luke 1:4). The same writer continues that Gospel history by adding this second treatise, containing a history of the further progress of Christianity. It is closely linked to the "former treatise," and was occasioned by the desire to give Theophilus further instruction.

As to the object of the book much has been written. The Tuebingen School of critics in its leading representatives has tenaciously clung to the theory of a hostility between Peter and Paul. They claim that in the early Church there were two factions irreconcilably hostile to each other, the one led by Peter, representing the Jewish element in the Church, and the other headed by Paul who represented the Gentile element. Now these critics boldly claim that the purpose of this book was irenical, that it attempts to minify these supposed differ-

ences between the two great Apostles and their respective adherents. It is held that the writer of this book was a Paulinist of a mild type, whose desire it was to show that there was not after all so much difference between Peter and Paul. Schneckenburger holds that the book was primarily written for Jewish Christians in order to remove from their minds their prejudices against Paul and his followers. Zeller says, "The work is a conciliatory essay offered by a member of the Pauline party to the Judaizers, with a view of obtaining the recognition of Gentile Christianity by concessions to Judaism, and thus exerting an influence on both parties." It is but just to add that an increasing number of critics, even those of a bold type, reject this theory. Schenkel, a critic who can never be accused of having a conservative bias, says, "Having never been able to convince myself of the sheer opposition between Paulinism and Petrinism, it has also never been possible for me to get a credible conception of a reconciliation effected by means of a literature sailing between the contending parties under false colors. In respect to the Acts of the Apostles in particular, I have been led in part to different results from those represented by the modern critical school. I have been forced to the conviction that it is a far more trustworthy source of information than is commonly allowed on the part of modern criticism."[8] In reference to the idea put forth by some, that this book is really a defense of the Apostle Paul against the attacks of the Jewish party, Weiss writes, "That the

[8] Quoted by Dods' N. T. Introd., p. 70.

Apostle's defense against Jewish-Christian attacks was in any sense the object of the work, cannot be proved."[9]

Of course these theories, and there are many different combinations of them, necessitate the denial of the Lucan authorship of the book, because of its assumed late origin. These theories also impugn the historical character of the book, and do not hesitate to charge the writer with having manufactured history to suit his purpose. In opposition to this whole theory that the purpose of the book was to reconcile deep-seated differences between the Apostles, and therefore distorted the history to that end, the following arguments may be noted: (1.) It is utterly irreconcilable with the unanimous testimony and belief of the early Church. (2.) It is a desperate makeshift of destructive criticism to bolster up a certain theory for the reconstruction of the history on the basis of a system of philosophy. (3.) It assumes a cunning on the part of the author of the book that is thoroughly inconsistent with its character. (4.) Its advocates "are obliged, in supporting it, to have recourse to utterly unnatural or decidedly false combinations, passing over in complete silence much in the book that is quite opposed to their assumptions." (5.) It is certainly revolting to the Christian conscience, because it saps the book of its high moral character, and reduces it to the level of cunning and deceit.

Dr. Schaff writes, The book "represents the origin and progress of Christianity from the capital of Judaism to the capital of heathenism. It is the history

[9] Weiss' Introd., Vol. II., p. 324.

of the planting of the Church among the Jews by Peter, and among the Gentiles by Paul. Its theme is expressed in the promise of the risen Christ to His disciples (1 : 8) : 'Ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost is come upon you (chap. 2) : and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem (chaps. 3–7) ; and in all Judea and Samaria (chaps. 8–12) ; and unto the uttermost part of the earth' (chaps. 13–28). The Gospel of Luke, which is the Pauline Gospel, laid the foundation by showing how salvation, coming from the Jews and opposed by the Jews, was intended for all men, Samaritans and Gentiles. The Acts exhibits the progress of the Church from and among the Jews to the Gentiles by the ministry of Peter, then of Stephen, then of Philip in Samaria, then of Peter again in the conversion of Cornelius, and at last by the labors of Paul and his companions."[10]

V. Contents.

I. Introduction. 1 : 1–3.

II. The founding of the Christian Church by the out-pouring of the Spirit on Pentecost, including the preparation of the disciples for the same. 1 : 4–2 : 47.

III. The development and history of the Church in Jerusalem. 3 : 1–7 : 60.

IV. The spread of the Church throughout Judea and Samaria. 8 : 1–12 : 25.

V. The spread of the Church among the Gentiles by the great missionary enterprises under Paul. 13 : 1–28 : 31.

[10] Schaff's History of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 726.

VI. Date and Place of Composition.

The Third Gospel has already been dated between 58 and 60 A. D., and during the time of the Cæsarean imprisonment. This book followed it at no very great interval of time. It must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, or even the liberation of Paul from his Roman imprisonment, since neither of these events is mentioned in it. Paul was brought to Rome as a prisoner in the spring of 61 A. D., and according to this book, he then dwelt in his own hired house for two years. At the time of the composition of this book, then, the Apostle had been a prisoner for two years. That seems to fix the date of it without any room for question. It was written during the spring of 63 A. D., or at least was finished about that time.

The book ends abruptly, possibly because its author was suddenly called away from the city to more active service in some other part of the Church, or, it may be that the change in the affairs of the Apostle upon the death of Burrhus, and the accession of Tigellinus to the prefectship of the Prætorian Cohorts, compelled his withdrawal from Rome. But however that may have been, there can be but little question but that the spring of 63 A. D. marks the time of the composition of the Acts. The place of composition was Rome.

CHAPTER V.

The Pauline Epistles — General Introduction.

I. The Life and Character of Paul the Apostle.

It does not lie within the scope of this work to give a detailed history of the life of this remarkable man. Paul, or Saul as he was known until he arrived at Cyprus on his first missionary journey, was born at Tarsus, the capital of the province of Cilicia. His parents were Jews, and his father possessed the rights of Roman citizenship. The early days of Saul were spent in his native city, and in all probability he received a part of his education there. Tarsus was one of the great educational centers, and in the halls of its famous university many of the greatest men of that period could be heard. How long Saul lived in Tarsus we do not know, but at an early age he was sent to Jerusalem to complete his education. As he makes no reference to his parents as living, it is not improbable that he was left an orphan in childhood. He had a sister living in Jerusalem (Acts 23 : 16), and one of the reasons of his removal to that city from Tarsus may have been to make his home with this sister. The principal reason, however, was that he might receive instruction from some of the rabbis of the

holy city. Gamaliel was the rabbi to whom the care of instructing Saul was committed. It was from this noted doctor of the law that he received his rabbinical training. He tells us that he was brought up in Jerusalem, that he was "taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God."

The first appearance of Saul in the apostolic history is in connection with the death of the protomartyr Stephen. Canon Farrar writes: "It is the first appearance in history of a name destined from that day forward to be memorable in the annals of the world. And how sad an allusion! He stands, not indeed actively engaged in the work of death, but keeping the clothes, consenting to the violence, of those who, in this brutal manner, dimmed in blood the light upon a face which had been radiant as that of an angel with faith and love." This murder of Stephen was the signal for a general outburst of persecutions against the Christians in and around Jerusalem. The fiery young disciple of Judaism leaped into prominence, and naturally became a leader in the onslaughts made on the followers of Christ. So fierce were these assaults that Jerusalem was speedily emptied of their victims. In his zeal for what he thought was God's service, Saul, at his own request, was commissioned by Theophilus, the cruel high priest, to go as far as Damascus, for the purpose of hunting down the heretics. It was as he was nearing Damascus that he was stricken down by Him whose cause he was assailing. In a moment the young Cilician zealot was converted, and all the en-

ergies of his life were turned into the service of Jesus of Nazareth.

The persecutor became the persecuted. After a few days Saul withdrew from Damascus, and went into Arabia, where he spent three years in seclusion. That time was unquestionably spent in preparation under the instruction of the Spirit for his new work. Returning at length to Damascus, he preached Christ, but he was not permitted to remain there. The Jews, whose champion he had been, conspired against his life, and he fled to Jerusalem. His stay in the holy city was only of fifteen days' duration (Gal. 1 : 18). There also persecution arose against him, and he retired to his old home in Cilicia (Acts 9 : 29, 30). It was work for his Redeemer doubtless that occupied his attention there, until he was summoned by Barnabas to assist in the work at Syrian Antioch. At that place, the time of waiting and preparation being over, he began his life of aggressive service for Christ. At the end of about a year's time, Saul was called by the Holy Spirit to go forth as the great pioneer missionary of the Christian Church.

In company with Barnabas and Mark, he set out, on his *First Missionary Journey*. Leaving Antioch they went by way of Seleucia to the island of Cyprus. After traversing the length of that island, they crossed over to the mainland of Asia Minor, landing at Perga in Pamphylia. On this journey they preached the Gospel and established churches in in Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe. Retracing their steps, they returned to Syrian Antioch, thus ending that first missionary journey.

From Antioch, Saul, now known as Paul, and having become the leader in this missionary work, went to Jerusalem to attend the Council held in that city in 50 A. D.,—a conference called together to settle the controversy that had arisen in regard to the Jewish rites and their relation to the Gentiles. At the conclusion of this Council the Apostle returned to Antioch.

In a short time Paul taking Silas with him began his *Second Missionary Journey*. He traveled Northwest by land, revisiting the disciples at Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch. At Lystra, Timothy joined the missionary band. Passing through Phrygia and Galatia, in which latter country they were detained longer than they had expected by the sickness of the Apostle, the missionaries guided by the Holy Spirit came at length to Alexandria Troas on the Ægean Sea, where Luke the historian became one of their company. From this point by divine direction, they crossed over the sea to Philippi. At this important city they established a church. Passing on through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they established churches in Thessalonica and Berea. From the latter point Paul went by sea to Athens, and from thence to Corinth, where he resided for eighteen months (Acts 18:11). At the end of that time Paul sailed from Corinth to Ephesus. Promising to return to that famous city, he hastened to Jerusalem to attend the approaching Feast of Pentecost. After that Feast the Apostle came back once more to Antioch.

After a short stay there the tireless Apostle started out on his *Third Missionary Journey*. On

this journey Paul revisited Phrygia and Galatia, and from thence he went to Ephesus, where he labored for three years. From Ephesus he passed by way of Troas into Macedonia, spending the Summer and Fall of that year in planting the Gospel as far west as Illyricum (Rom. 15 : 19–23). The following Winter was spent in Corinth (Acts 20 : 2). As soon as Winter was past, Paul began his journey to Jerusalem, carrying with him the offering that had been made in Macedonia and Achaia for the poor saints at Jerusalem. The route he took was overland by way of Philippi. From thence crossing over to Troas, he made his journey by water, touching at numerous points on the way to Cæsarea. Going up to Jerusalem from Cæsarea, he was in a few days arrested, having been rescued by the chief captain Lysias from the hands of the mob of infuriated Jews, who were bent on his death.

Because of the danger threatening him in Jerusalem, the Apostle was shortly afterwards transferred to Cæsarea, where he passed two years in confinement as a prisoner under Felix. Soon after the accession of Festus to the governorship, in accordance with his appeal to Cæsar, Paul was sent to Rome to have his case judged by Nero. It was late in the Fall when the journey to Rome was begun. The storm that arose on that voyage completely wrecked the ship, but all the lives on board were saved, the whole party being cast on the island of Malta. Early the next Spring Paul was brought to Rome, and delivered over to the custody of the Prætorian Prefect. At the end of two years, his case having been favorably decided, he was lib-

erated. As the history of the Acts terminates just before this release, we do not have it as our guide for the movements of the Apostle after that event, and we are dependent on the references of the Pastoral Epistles. From these we gather that he returned to Ephesus. After a time, if the tradition be true, he journeyed as far west as Spain. From Spain he came back to Ephesus. Ere long he had to take a trip to Macedonia, but came back from there to Ephesus again. Then there came the trip to Crete with Titus, and the Apostle returned once more to Ephesus. From Ephesus by way of Miletus and Corinth, Paul went to Nicopolis in Epirus. Danger confronting him at that place, the Apostle left there hurriedly and journeyed to Troas, where he left his cloak and books and parchment. Venturing to Ephesus, he was arrested and carried to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom the following Summer.

The accession of Festus to the governorship of Judea in 60 A. D., furnishes a most important help in determining the dates of the events of Paul's life. Two years before Festus succeeded Felix, Paul was arrested in Jerusalem just after Pentecost. The three months of the previous Winter were spent at Corinth, Paul having left Ephesus immediately after Pentecost of 57 A. D. The three years' residence at Ephesus carries us back to 54 A. D., as the time of his arrival there on his third missionary journey. The time occupied by his return from Corinth to Jerusalem and Antioch, completing his second journey, would be several months. Previous to that, he spent a year and a half at Cor-

inth, which would place the time of his first arrival at Corinth in the Fall of 52 A. D. He attended the Council of Jerusalem in 50 A. D., and he dates his conversion fourteen years before that event, that is, 37 A. D. Going back now to the beginning of Festus' governorship, we find that Paul was sent to Rome shortly after it began, that is, late in 60 A. D. He reached Rome in the Spring of the following year, and was released two years later, that is, 63 A. D. Nero died in June of 68 A. D., and Paul's martyrdom probably occurred shortly before that event.

The following will give in their order in time the chief events in the Apostle's life.

Conversion	37
Return from Arabia	40
Fifteen days' visit in Jerusalem	40
Flight to Cilicia	40
Went to Antioch	43
First Missionary Journey begun	45
Council at Jerusalem	50
Second Missionary Journey begun	50
Eighteen months' residence in Corinth	52–54
At Pentecost at Jerusalem	May 31, 54
Third Missionary Journey begun	Summer, 54
Three years at Ephesus	Late in 54 to Pentecost, 57
Three months' residence in Corinth	Winter, 57–58
Arrested in Jerusalem	Pentecost, 58
Prisoner at Cæsarea	58–60
Prisoner at Rome	61–63
Period of freedom	63–67
Martyrdom	May, 68

A few words must be written about the character of this great Apostle to the Gentiles. He was a great man in every sense of the word. Canon

Farrar writes: "There are souls in which the burning heat of some transfusing purpose calcines every other thought, every other desire, every other admiration; and St. Paul's was one. His life was absorbingly, if not solely and exclusively, the spiritual life — the life which is utterly dead to every other interest of the groaning and travailing creation, the life hid with Christ in God."[1] Paul was always true to his conscience, and his words to Felix, "And herein do I exercise myself, to have always a conscience void of offense toward God, and toward man" (Acts 24 : 16), accurately describe the man, so far as we can gather from what we know of him from the Acts and from his own writings. When he became a Christian, he gave every power and every faculty to the service of his Saviour. Dr. Stalker[2] gives as the elements of his character, his spirit of enterprise, his influence over men, his spirit of unselfishness, his sense of having a mission to fulfill, and his personal devotion to Christ. He was a man of sincerity, of strong determination of will, of uncompromising adherence to duty.

Humility, tenderness, and affection marked Paul's whole life. He could be severe to the last extreme, if occasion called for it, but it was never to assert self that he showed the depths of feeling of which he was capable. Let anything appear to touch the honor of the cause he represented, or to assail his teaching, and the lightning would flash from his eye and the thunder roll from his tongue. "It has often been observed that there is a remarkable resemblance between Paul and Luther. And certainly

[1] Life and Work of St. Paul, ch. 2.
[2] Life of St. Paul, ch. 7.

in many points there is a resemblance: the same heroic zeal, the same decision, the same sincerity, the same indefatigable energy, the same sympathy with humanity, the same liberality of mind, actuated both. But Paul was a much higher type of man than the great Reformer: his unworldliness was more complete, his charity was more universal, his joyfulness was more spiritual, his temper was more heavenly."[3][4]

II. The Writings of the Apostle Paul.

We possess thirteen Epistles that explicitly claim to be Paul's, and as such they have been received by the Church in all ages. To these we must add the Epistle to the Hebrews, although it nowhere claims to be Pauline. The thirteen naturally are divided into three classes.

1. The Early Epistles, consisting of First and Second Thessalonians, Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, and Romans.

2. The Epistles of the Captivity, consisting of Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians.

3. The Pastoral Epistles, namely, First and Second Timothy and Titus.

The following table gives the times and places of composition of the various Epistles: —

First Thessalonians	Corinth	52
Second Thessalonians	Corinth	53
Galatians	Ephesus	57
First Corinthians	Ephesus	57

[3] Gloag's Introd., p. 18.

[4] For the history of Paul's life consult the great work of Conybeare and Howson. Gloag's Introd. and Stalker's Life of Paul are worthy of the closest study in their descriptions of the character of Paul.

Second Corinthians	Macedonia	57
Romans	Corinth	58
Colossians	Rome	62
Philemon	Rome	62
Ephesians	Rome	62
Philippians	Rome	63
First Timothy	Macedonia	67
Titus	Ephesus	67
Second Timothy	Rome	67

Whether we possess all the Epistles that Paul wrote is a much disputed question. It is possible that a short Epistle written to the Corinthians is now lost. If this is true, it is because it was merely a specific direction in regard to a particular offense in the Corinthian Church, and was only necessary for that one occasion (1 Cor. 5 : 9). Some have attempted to prove that an Epistle to the Laodiceans (Col. 4 : 16) has been lost, but it is probable that this was none other than the one now known as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

The authenticity of these Epistles will be considered in connection with the study of each one in its order. It may be noted here, however, that Eusebius classifies them all under the head of the *undisputed* Epistles. Marcion (130) gives ten Pauline Epistles in his list, omitting the three Pastoral Epistles, which he did not accept, possibly because they did not at all harmonize with his heretical opinions. The Muratori Canon (170) names the thirteen, omitting Hebrews. Caius of Rome (210) mentions the thirteen. The Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions include them all. Individual Epistles have been assailed by rationalistic critics in this century, but the Church as a whole has always and everywhere ac-

cepted the thirteen Epistles and also Hebrews as Pauline, with a notable exception in regard to this latter Epistle that will be considered when it is studied.

These Epistles can be studied most intelligently by considering them in their chronological order. This is the plan that will be pursued as we turn now to the study of their special introduction.

CHAPTER VI.

The Pauline Epistles — Special Introduction.

1. The Early Epistles.

I. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

I. Canonicity.

It was not until the present century that the first assault was made upon this Epistle, for up to that time no one had ever even thought of questioning its right to a place in the New Testament Canon. It is true that we do not find it extensively quoted in the early Christian writings, but still we can find sufficient *external* testimony in its favor to establish its canonicity. The allusions to it in the Apostolic Fathers are not absolutely certain, but there are, to say the least, some marked coincidences between passages in it and in Ignatius (115), and in Polycarp (116). Marcion (130) included it in his catalogue, and it is named in the Muratori Canon (170). It is found also in the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions. In the writings of Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195), we have positive and unqualified testimony to the Pauline authorship of this Epistle. These witnesses come from all parts of the Church.

Turning to the Epistle itself, the *internal* evidence is found to be even more positive. It claims to be by Paul (1:1; 2:18). All of its historical allusions fit into and agree with the events of the life of Paul so far as recorded in the Acts (2:2, cf. Acts 16:22; 3:4, cf. Acts 17:5; 2:17, cf. Acts 18:5). The character of the Apostle, as well as his style in composition, are indelibly stamped upon it. "The character of Paul is impressed on this Epistle: his anxiety about his converts (3:1, 2); his earnest desire for their spiritual good (3:8–11); his almost womanly tenderness (2:7); his joy when he hears from Timothy of the steadfastness of their faith (3:6, 7); and his sympathy with them in their distresses (4:13, 18)."[1]

By some late writers it has been objected that this Epistle is too devoid of doctrinal statements to have proceeded from the pen of the Apostle. But when the circumstances that led to the composition of the letter are considered, the absence of doctrinal statements is easily accounted for. There were no heresies to combat, and consequently there was no special call for statements of doctrine. And moreover the whole Epistle in other respects is in keeping with Pauline authorship. And when the historical allusions, as well as the general characteristics, of the Epistle are found to be in harmony, not only with its own asserted Pauline authorship, but also with the external evidence to that fact, we may well accept it as a genuine Pauline Epistle, having an indisputable right to a place in the New Testament Canon.

[1] Gloag's Introduction to the Pauline Epistles, p. 81.

II. The Church at Thessalonica.

Thessalonica was an important city in Paul's day, being situated on the great Egnatian highway and at the head of the Thermaic Bay. Having a splendid natural harbor, and being so favorably situated, it became the second city in size and importance in Macedonia. It was named after the sister of Alexander the Great. Its business advantages made it a thriving city, with a large and mixed population, of which the Jews constituted a large part. It remains to this day under the name of Saloniki, and is still a city of considerable importance.

When Paul arrived there on his second missionary journey, he devoted his attention for three successive weeks to his countrymen, of whom a large number resided in this city. The success that attended his preaching aroused the hostility of these Jews. Driven by their opposition from the synagogue, the Apostle labored for some time with signal success among the Gentiles. This enraged the Jews beyond measure, and their hatred soon found expression in a furious riot that they with certain idle vagabonds of the city created. In their rage they sought the missionaries, but, failing to find them, they seized upon one Jason and certain other converts. Taking these persons before the magistrates, they accused them of treason against the Emperor. They characterized the missionaries as "these that have turned the world upside down." The Kingship of Jesus was apparently the basis and the burden of Paul's preaching at Thessalonica, and from this the rabble easily formulated the charge of treason against the

law and the Emperor. The outcome of these proceedings was that Jason and his companions were bound over to keep the peace (Acts 17 : 1–9).

It was evident to the converts of Paul that he could not remain safely in the city in the face of such opposition. Nor could any work be accomplished as long as such excitement continued, so the brethren sent Paul and Silas away. Proceeding on his journey, Paul came to Berea, where Timothy soon joined him and Silas. The work in Berea was even more promising than it had been at Thessalonica, but it was soon stopped by the active enemies of Paul, who followed him from that city as soon as they had heard of his presence and success in Berea. Leaving Silas and Timothy to continue the work, the Apostle went on in company with certain Bereans to Athens, where Timothy at Paul's earnest request presently followed him. Hearing from Timothy of continued persecutions of the Christians at Thessalonica, he sent that faithful young disciple back to comfort and strengthen them (1 Thess. 3 : 1–3). Passing on from Athens, Paul soon reached Corinth, where he ere long was rejoined by Silas and Timothy, who brought him a full account of the condition of affairs at Thessalonica.

The principal element in the Thessalonian church was Gentile. They are described as having "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God" (1 Thess. 1 : 9). There are no quotations from, and scarcely any allusions to, the Old Testament in the two letters written to them. The history of the Acts records that "some of them [*i. e.* Jews] believed and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout

Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few" (Acts 17:4). Thus with a slight Jewish sprinkling, the Gentile element largely predominated in the Thessalonian church. How long the Apostle remained in the city after his expulsion from the synagogue at the end of three weeks, we do not know, but he must have been there several weeks longer in order to have accomplished what he did. In that time his work grew with great rapidity and marked success, so that ere he was compelled to leave the city the number of believers was large.

III. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

The immediate *occasion* of the writing of this Epistle was the coming of Timothy and Silas to Paul at Corinth, bringing him a full account of affairs at Thessalonica. Since the moment when he had sent Timothy to them from Athens, Paul had been anxious to hear how the Thessalonian Christians were progressing. Twice he had attempted to revisit them, but had been hindered (2:18), and consequently he had had to wait for his companions to come to him. The report that was brought to him was in the main satisfactory. "Believers, in spite of persecutions, continued steadfast in their faith and in their attachment to Paul, their spiritual father (3:6, 7), so that they became examples to all that believe in Thessalonica and Achaia (1:7): their faith was everywhere spread abroad, and their love to one another abounded." Mixed with this good report, however, was information that was not so satisfactory. They were far from perfect. Heathen vices still clung to some of their number. False views of

the Second Advent of Christ had disturbed others, who had ceased from their usual occupations, and had become actual nuisances to the church, in their idle expectancy of the immediate coming of the Saviour. Some also had died, and their friends were greatly distressed, because they thought that the dead could not participate in the blessings of that glorious event.

Without losing any time the Apostle wrote this Epistle, and his *object*, writes Dr. Gloag, was "to confirm the Thessalonians in the Christian faith, to exhort them to relinquish those vices in which they still indulged, to comfort them in the sufferings to which they were exposed, to console them under the loss of their friends, and to exhort them to make further progress in every department of Christian character."[2]

IV. The Outline of the Epistle.

This Epistle is naturally divided into two parts, the historical and the practical.

I. The Historical Portion. 1 : 1–3 : 13.

1. Salutation. 1 : 1.
2. Gratefully records their conversion and progress. 1 : 2–10.
3. Asserts the purity and blamelessness of his life among them. 2 : 1–12.
4. Renews his thanksgiving for their conversion, referring to the persecutions they had suffered. 2 : 13–16.
5. Recounts his anxiety for them, his sending Timothy, his joy at the word brought to him. 2 : 17–3 : 10.

[2] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 90.

6. Prays for them. 3 : 11–13.

II. The Practical Portion. 4 : 1–5 : 28.

1. Warning against impurity. 4 : 1–8.
2. Exhortation to Christian love, and to earnestness of life. 4 : 9–12.
3. Refers to the matter of the Second Advent. 4 : 13–5 : 11.
   (*a*) The part the dead are to play in it. 4 : 13–18.
   (*b*) The time uncertain. 5 : 1–3.
   (*c*) The need for watchfulness. 5 : 4–11.
4. Exhortation to orderly living and to obedience. 5 : 12–15.
5. Sundry injunctions. 5 : 16–22.
6. Again prays for them. 5 : 23, 24.
7. Closing injunctions and benediction. 5 : 25-28.

V. When and Where Written.

The date of this Epistle can quite readily be fixed. The postscript in our English Bible informs us that it was written at Athens, but this is manifestly an error. It is to be remembered that the postscripts at the ends of the Epistles are of no more authority than the headings of the chapters, since they do not form part of the original text. Silas and Timothy are associated with the Apostle in the salutation, and it was written immediately after Timothy had brought his report to Paul. It was while he was at Corinth that these two workers joined the Apostle (Acts 18 : 5). The letter must then have been written at Corinth during Paul's eighteen months' residence there,

which period ended with the Spring of the year 54, for we never find Silas (Silvanus) associated with Paul after this period. Enough time must have elapsed between the departure of Paul from Thessalonica and the writing of this Epistle, for the spread of their faith, for the Apostle to have made two attempts to revisit them, and for some of their number to have died. A few months will suffice for these things. The Second Epistle was also written during this same period, and we must allow sufficient time to elapse between the composition of these two Epistles for the development shown in the Second Epistle. This necessitates dating this First Epistle early in that period, that is, late in 52 A. D., or possibly early in 53 A. D.

VI. Peculiarities of the Epistle.

No little interest is attached to this Epistle because of the fact that it is the first that proceeded from the pen of the great Apostle. Clear-cut statements of doctrines were not usually given until heresy had arisen, and there was need for defining the truth. It is doubtless true that the germs of heresy were already in existence when this Epistle was written, but they had not assumed such a shape that they needed to be controverted. For this reason these Epistles to the Thessalonians deal with practice rather than with doctrine. There was no special occasion for the statement of any of those doctrines that were peculiarly Pauline a few years later. But it cannot be said that this Epistle is colorless, for the divinity of Christ is most clearly recognized. As the Epistle, how-

ever, was intended to correct errors of conduct rather than to combat errors of belief, it would be unreasonable to look for any formal dogmatic statements in it. The end to which it was directed was the securing of purity of life and of industry, rather than instruction in doctrine.

The frequent use of the name "Lord" as applied to Jesus is especially noticeable. No less than twenty-five times is the Saviour called by this title. "It is impossible for any subsequent declaration of the divinity of Christ to rise beyond that afforded by St. Paul's frequent application of the attribute of 'Lord' to Jesus in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. The Apostle has already exhausted human language and human thought. The plummet of dogma can drop no deeper; the wing of adoration can soar no higher."[3] And since this is true in an especial sense of this Epistle, it is not surprising that Paul in it explicitly and directly worships Jesus by prayer, saying, "Now may our God and Father Himself, and our Lord Jesus, direct our way unto you: and the Lord make you to increase and abound in love" (3:11, R. V.).

Finally, it is worthy of note that the Thessalonians were organized into a church (1:1); they had a regular ministry (5:12–13); and at a regular meeting of their church this Epistle was to be read (5:27). The Thessalonians were consequently fully equipped for worship and service. The importance of this Epistle from an ecclesiastical standpoint is very great, for it presents to us at this early date a church with regularly appointed

[3] Lord Bishop of Derry in the Bible Commentary, Introd. to Thess.

officers, who had a recognized authority over their brethren.

II. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

I. Canonicity.

The *external* testimony in support of this Epistle is more positive than that in favor of the First Epistle. There can be but little question about Polycarp's (116) use of it. Justin Martyr (145) gives very clear evidence of his having it in his possession. Marcion (130) accorded it a place in his catalogue, and it is also found in the Muratori Canon (170). It is also contained in the Syriac (160), and Old Latin (170) Versions. Passing on to the last quarter of the second century, we find it definitely quoted as Pauline by Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195). There is thus an unbroken line of witnesses in favor of it, while there is not a single voice or name from any part of the early Church to be cited in opposition to it.

The *internal* testimony is likewise positively in support of Pauline authorship. The style, as well as the contents, of the letter proclaims this fact so plainly that those who for subjective reasons deny its genuineness, are sorely put to in their efforts to explain away the unmistakable marks of the Apostle's hand. The character of Paul is indelibly stamped upon it in "his lively sympathy with his converts, his tenderness when censuring them, his commendation of them, his characteristic mention of himself and his desire for an interest in their prayers." The individuality of Paul is apparent throughout the

whole Epistle. We have "in short, as many internal proofs of Pauline origin as could be expected to be found in so short an Epistle." And to these facts must be added the specific claim to Pauline authorship in the opening salutation, as well as at the close of the letter, where we read, "The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write" (3:17).

It was not until the year 1804 A. D. that any one undertook to assail this Epistle. It may be asked, then, how it happens that any have denied its Pauline authorship in the face of the existing evidence. The offense is found in the famous passage relating to the "man of sin" (2:3–12). The prophetical character of this section is undeniable, if attributed to Paul. The philosophical theories of the assailants of this Epistle do not admit of any such thing as predictive prophecy. "Get rid of the supernatural at all hazards," is the watchword of these critics. Positive historical testimony must be explained away, if it comes into conflict with their philosophy. And in order to do this these critics have certainly indulged in a great deal of what Professor Salmon has well called "childish criticism." The attempt has been made to prove that the Epistle is a forgery by a later hand. But we may heartily agree with Bleek, who, referring to this passage, says, "Indeed the whole tone of the passage is so individual, intuitive, and characteristic that it is difficult to conceive of it as a forgery of some late author."[3] And in the same line Weiss may be quoted,

[3] Bleek's Introd. to the N. T., Vol. I., p. 417.

who affirms that "the eschatological view of our Epistle is not only not an argument against its genuineness, but on the contrary is the only ground on which it can be explained."[4]

We may then feel well satisfied that this Epistle is a genuine Pauline Epistle, and that in consequence of this it has a right to a place among the canonical books of the New Testament.

II. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

It is impossible to tell who carried the First Epistle to its destination. Doubtless in a few short months another report came to the Apostle concerning the status of affairs at Thessalonica since the reception of the First Epistle. This report had many encouraging features. Progress had been made in faith and in love by the Thessalonian Christians, and there was much to cause thanksgiving on the part of the Apostle. Those who formerly were greatly distressed by the death of their friends, had been comforted by the words of the first letter. But in spite of all this the idea of an immediate coming of the Lord had taken a firmer hold on the minds of some of them. Persecutions were still raging around the young Christian church, and in some cases there was a decided increase of fanaticism. The results of the expectancy of a speedy advent had been very demoralizing, for some had entirely ceased from their accustomed occupations. As busy-bodies they were interfering with those who desired to work.

Such disorders as had arisen could not be tolerated at

[4] Weiss' Manual of Introd. to the N. T., Vol. I., p. 234.

all, and in his faithfulness the Apostle sternly rebukes it. Feeling called on to exercise his apostolic authority, he commands the disorderly ones "that with quietness they work and eat their own bread" (3 : 12). In connection with this matter the Apostle beseeches them not "to be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand" (2 : 2). Evidently the Thessalonians had either misinterpreted what Paul had written in the First Epistle, or else a forged letter under Paul's name had been received by them. If the latter, as seems much more probable, it doubtless taught the immediate coming of Christ, and thus augmented the disturbance in that line. The emphatic way in which Paul subscribes this letter (3 : 17) confirms the idea that it was a spurious letter by whose words they had been troubled.

The occasion of this Epistle was the reception of additional news from Thessalonica. The main design was to rectify the serious error into which they had fallen regarding the Second Advent, and also in this connection to warn them against that idle and disorderly condition into which some of their number had fallen. In addition to this he uses the opportunity to praise and commend the obedient for the progress they had made, and he exhorts them to continue in that way. The letter thus instructs, consoles, encourages, and admonishes its readers.

III. The Outline of the Epistle.

I. Salutation. 1 : 1, 2.
II. Introduction. 1 : 3–12.

1. He thanks God for their progress in faith and in charity. 1 : 3.
2. Commends their patience in suffering. 1 : 4.
3. Reminds them of the righteous judgments of God yet to come. 1 : 5–10.
4. Prays for them. 1 : 11, 12.

III. Dogmatic Portion, in which he speaks of the "Man of Sin," correcting the erroneous ideas that had arisen among them in regard to the Second Advent. 2 : 1–12.

IV. Hortatory Portion. 2 : 13–3 : 15.

1. Renews his thanksgiving on their behalf. 2 : 13, 14.
2. Exhorts them to stand fast. 2 : 15.
3. Prays for them. 2 : 16, 17.
4. Asks for their prayers in his own behalf. 3 : 1–3.
5. Affirms his confidence in them. 3 : 4, 5.
6. Reproves the disorderly, citing his own example among them, and charges the faithful to separate themselves from all such. 3 : 6–15.

V. Conclusion. 3 : 16–18.

1. Prays again for them. 3 : 16.
2. Closing salutation and benediction. 3 : 17, 18.

IV. Date and Place of Composition.

The First Epistle was written at Corinth at the close of 52 A. D., or possibly early in 53 A. D. This Second Epistle was written at the same place a few months later. The name of Silas (Silvanus) is never again associated with Paul after this residence in Corinth, and for this reason this letter must have been written during this same period. All the time that we need to allow between the two Epistles

is what would be sufficient for the reception of the First at Thessalonica, for it to become well known to the Christians there, and for their messenger to return to the Apostle with a full account of its reception and effect. This would require several months. It is to be noted that the circumstances of the Thessalonians do not seem to have changed much since the time of the former communication. The request of the Apostle for their prayers for his deliverance from wicked and unreasonable men (3: 2), may refer to the outbreak in Corinth after the accession of Gallio to the deputy-ship of Achaia (Acts 18: 12–17). The most probable date seems to be the latter part of the Summer of 53 A. D.

V. Peculiarities of this Epistle.

The most marked peculiarity of this Epistle is its apocalyptic section on the "Man of Sin" (2: 1–12). It seems scarcely necessary to affirm that there is no real antagonism between the two Epistles in regard to the matter of the Second Advent of the Saviour. "The one Epistle," writes Professor Salmon, "presents our Lord's second coming as possibly soon, the other as not immediate — as needing that certain prophetic preliminary signs should first be fulfilled." [5] This section is clearly prophetic in its character. And this "prophecy is not independent of previous ones, — its roots are in Daniel, and from the beginning to the end it is full of allusions to our Lord's great apocalyptic discourse." [6]

[5] Salmon's Introd. to the N. T., p. 460.

[6] See Professor Warfield's articles on the Prophecies of St. Paul in the Expositor. 3rd Series, Vol. IV., p. 30.

III. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

I. Canonicity.

The list of *external* testimonies to this Epistle certainly includes Polycarp (116), if not also Clement of Rome (96), and Ignatius (115). The writer of the epistle to Diognetus (117) shows his dependence on it. Marcion (130) included it in his catalogue, omitting, however, two passages in it that contradicted his peculiar teachings. Justin Martyr (145) quotes it, and so does Tatian the Syrian (150–170). It is found in the Muratori Canon (170), as well as in the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions. Certain early heretics, including the Ophites and others, used it. Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195) repeatedly quote it by name and ascribe it to Paul.

The *internal* evidence is likewise strong. The letter claims to be by Paul, reciting some of the events of his life not given elsewhere. The historical references are capable of being perfectly harmonized with the Acts. It is also unquestionably Pauline in its matter, as well as in its manner. "The vehemence of temper, the desire to be present among them, the mixture of severity and tenderness in the censures, and the uncompromising maintenance of the great principle of Christian liberty, which pervade the Epistle, all remind of Paul, and are all beyond the art of a forger of the second century."[7] Indeed "its every sentence so completely reflects the life and character of the Apostle to the Gentiles that its genuine-

[7] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 137.

ness has not been seriously questioned," except by a very few, and they are of the ultra rationalistic school of Dutch critics who question everything. It may then be said that "he who denies its genuineness pronounces on himself the sentence of incapacity to distinguish false from true."[8]

So strong is this evidence from both sources, internal and external, that even many critics who reject other Epistles, acknowledge this one to be a genuine Pauline Epistle. Such a concession is an acknowledgment of the force of the evidence. There is not the slightest reason for a doubt as to the authenticity and genuineness of this Epistle.

II. The Galatian Churches.

The Galatians were descendants of the Gauls who invaded Greece and Asia Minor about three centuries before the Christian Era. For a time these fierce Northerners swept everything before them, but at length they were defeated in 238 B. C., by Antiochus Soter, King of Syria, and Attalus, King of Pergamos. After that disastrous defeat they were confined to a part of Phrygia, and they gave the name of Galatia to it. The Galatia of Paul and Luke was not the Roman province of that name, but was the earlier kingdom of Galatia which was only a part of it.

A close examination of all the references to Galatia makes it evident that the New Testament writers had in mind a narrower district than that of the Roman province.

[8] Quoted by Dean Howson in Bible Commentary.

Passing through various fortunes, Galatia finally became absorbed in that province. "The country of Galatia afforded great facilities for commercial enterprise. With fertile plains rich in agricultural produce, with extensive pastures for flocks, with a temperate climate and copious rivers, it abounded in all those resources out of which a commerce is created."[9] The principal cities were Ancyra, Tavium, and Pessinus. The special privileges granted to the Jews of Galatia attracted many of that nationality to the province, and their influence became powerful among the Galatians. In addition to these Gaulish descendants and the Jews, there were the remnants of the aboriginal tribes. But despite this mixture of inhabitants, the Galatians largely retained their Celtic language and characteristics.

The Galatians had some marked characteristics. "Fickleness was a striking feature in the character of the Galatian converts. No country embraced the Gospel so readily and cordially. They received Paul with such gratitude and respect, as if he were an angel of God, yea, as if he were Jesus Christ Himself; and they were willing, if it would have benefited the Apostle, to have plucked out their own eyes, and to have given them to him (Gal. 4: 14, 15). But no church fell so quickly from the faith. Soon converted, they soon relapsed into Judaism. Impulsive and easily acted upon by the Apostle, they were easily acted upon by false teachers."[10] The Galatians were also superstitious and cruel. "The worship of Cy-

[9] Lightfoot on Gal., p. 18.

[10] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 140.

bele, with its wild ceremonial and hideous mutilations, would naturally be attractive to the Gaulish mind."

It was upon his second missionary journey that Paul in company with Silas and Timothy came into Galatia. A sudden attack of his peculiar malady, his thorn in the flesh, evidently compelled the Apostle to remain there longer than he had at first intended. Utilizing his enforced stay, he preached the Gospel to the Galatians, who heard with readiness his words and embraced the salvation offered through Christ. Instead of being repulsed by the nature of his disease, they had fairly rallied around Paul. His own words are, "Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh I preached the Gospel unto you at the first. And my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. . . . For I bear you record, that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me" (4 : 13–15). We have no means of telling how long the missionary band remained in Galatia, but it is evident that phenomenal success attended their labors. Some three years later (54 A. D.) Paul revisited the churches of Galatia, of which there were several, probably one in each of the three principal cities already named, if not also in other places in the province. On that second visit, which was during the Apostle's third missionary journey, he was principally engaged in "strengthening all the disciples." Passing from thence, Paul went on to Ephesus, reaching that city late in 54 A. D., and remaining there until Pentecost, 57 A. D.

III. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

Professor Warfield calls this "the fiery and tumultuous letter," and such it truly is, for it is eminently controversial. It was near the close of his residence at Ephesus, and about three years after his last visit in Galatia, that Paul was astounded to hear that the churches of Galatia were actually in danger of turning their backs upon him and the Gospel he had preached to them with apparently so great success. "The tone of surprise of his letter sufficiently proves that he was wholly unprepared for the bad news when it did reach him, and this apparently indicates that he had not heard from the Galatian churches for some time."[11] Judaizing teachers had made their appearance among the Galatians. They were attempting to undermine the authority of the Apostle, and were teaching a very different gospel from the one he had taught. Now, much as the former touched him, he resented far more the perversion of the truth.

The reception of this information was the occasion of this letter, and his object in writing it was to defend his own apostolic authority and to confute the erroneous teachings of the Judaizing teachers, as well as to exhort the Galatian Christians to constancy in the faith he had preached to them. Dean Howson writes: "In writing this Epistle he had two purposes in view, each essentially

[11] So argues Professor Warfield in a paper read before the Exegetical Society in Dec., 1884, in which he proves that so far from the Apostle's having had any intimation of defection at the time of his second visit to Galatia, he supposed that all was satisfactory until the stunning news of apostasy came to him.

bound up with the other. He found it necessary on the one hand to assert and demonstrate his apostolic independence and authority, and on the other hand to re-state and to prove by argument the doctrine of free justification through faith. These things are done with great vehemence and force. The news from Galatia had startled him and filled him with anxiety. He saw what great principles were at stake, and how the whole future of Christianity was likely to be compromised. Hence there is in this Epistle an impress of severity and indignation, which we find in no other." [12]

IV. Outline of the Contents of the Epistle.

The following is the outline of contents as given by Professor Warfield : —

I. Apostolic address and greeting. 1 : 1–5.

II. Statement of the object of this Epistle, with expressions of wonder at their speedy falling away from the true Gospel. 1 : 6–10.

III. Treatment of the first disputed fact, that Paul did not receive his Gospel from man's teaching. 1 : 11–2 : 14.

1. Formal affirmation of this fact. 1 : 11, 12.
2. Proof of this fact. 1 : 13–2 : 14.
   (1.) His former intense Judaism. 1 : 13, 14.
   (2.) Rescued by divine power, he did not look to man for counsel and guidance. 1 : 15–17.
   (3.) It was true that he visited Jerusalem, but it was three years after his conversion and for only fifteen days. 1 : 18, 19.

[12] See Bible Commentary, Introd. to Gal.

(4.) Solemn asseveration of the truth of his statement. 1 : 20.

(5.) So far from remaining with the apostles, he went far away. 1 : 21–24.

(6.) Had been preaching independently for fourteen years. 2 : 1–10.

(7.) Above all that, he had withstood Peter at Antioch for his temporary vacillation. 2 : 11–14.

IV. Treatment of second disputed fact, that salvation is by faith alone and not by works. 2 : 15–5 : 12.

1. Transition to new subject. 2 : 15–21.

2. Proof of doctrine that justification is by faith. 3 : 1–5 : 12.

(1.) Experience of the Galatians. 3 : 1–5.

(2.) Mode of Abraham's justification. 3 : 6–9.

(3.) Scriptural account of the effect of the law. 3 : 10–14.

(4.) Proof from the nature of the promises. 3 : 15–18.

(5.) Answer to the objection that this makes the law of none effect. 3 : 19–29.

(6.) Answer to the objection that the Church was for ages under the law. 4 : 1–7.

(7.) Appeals to them not to Judaize. 4 : 8–20.

(8.) Final argument derived from the typical teaching of the law itself. 4 : 21–30.

(9.) Earnest appeal to them to abide in this freedom in Christ. 4 : 31–5 : 12.

V. Practical exhortations growing out of the foregoing. 5 : 13–6 : 10.

1. Not to let their freedom degenerate into license. 5 : 13–15.
2. How to keep the law. 5 : 16–18.
3. Real test of walking by the Spirit. 5 : 19–26.
4. Examples of fulfilling the law. 6 : 1–10.

VI. Conclusion in Paul's own handwriting. 6 : 11–18.
1. Calls attention to the large letters. 6 : 11.
2. Exposes the motives of the Judaizers. 6 : 12, 13.
3. Gives the proper object of glorying and the reason for this. 6 : 14, 15.
4. Invokes a blessing. 6 : 16.
5. His own authority no longer to be disputed. 6 : 17.
6. Benediction. 6 : 18.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

It is extremely difficult, if not utterly impossible, to fix absolutely the date of this Epistle, because of its singular lack of time marks. This has given rise to great diversity of opinion on this matter among scholars. It is to be noted, however, that this difference of opinion is only as to the exact point in time between 55 A. D., and 58 A. D., when it was written. It is generally agreed that the meeting of Gal. 2 : 2 was the Council of Jerusalem of 50 A. D. (Acts 15). The manifest allusions to his second visit (1 : 9; 4 : 13; 5 : 21) seem to necessitate dating it after the visit on the third missionary journey in 54 A. D. Quite a number of writers taking the words "so quickly" (1 : 6) have supposed that they refer to his second visit, and accordingly date the Epistle soon thereafter and early

in the three years' residence at Ephesus, *i. e.* late in 54 A. D., or early in 55 A. D. Then the manifest relation of this Epistle to that to the Romans, the latter being a more formal enunciation of the doctrinal part of the former, necessitates dating it before February, 58 A. D., when Romans was composed. Professor Jowett writes: "The similarity and dissimilarity between the two Epistles (Galatians and Romans) are of that kind which tends to show that the Epistle to the Galatians could not have been written either after or contemporaneously with the Epistle to the Romans, and that it was not therefore a compendium of it; nor is it probable that it was written very long before it."[13] We thus obtain as our two outside limits of time 54 and 58 A. D. But where in this period does this Epistle come?

Within this same period come the two letters to the Corinthian Church. Bishop Lightfoot presents an elaborate argument for putting Galatians after First Corinthians, and argues that it was written after the Apostle left Ephesus, that is, after Pentecost, 57 A. D.[14] On the other hand, Professor Warfield[15] presents the strongest arguments for dating Galatians before First Corinthians. Taking the passages usually relied upon to prove that Paul was cognizant of the growing defection among the Galatians on his second visit to them in 54 A. D., he argues that they do not furnish the supposed basis for such a state of affairs. "There is," he writes, "a complete lack of anything that will justify us in asserting it

[13] Jowett's Epistles of St. Paul, Vol. I., p. 202.

[14] Lightfoot on Galatians, p. 42.

[15] Journal of Exegetical Society, 1885.

to be even probable that the Judaizing heresy had already broken out, or even that unhealthy symptoms threatening the purity of the Church had already appeared, or that there was an inclination to yield to them apparent." Turning to First Corinthians, Dr. Warfield dwells upon "a few obscure allusions in the letter (16:1; 9:2; 7:17; 4:17) which taken together seem to raise a probability in favor of the priority of Galatians to that Epistle sufficient to determine our opinion." These passages must be studied in detail in order that their cumulative force may be felt, for it is acknowledged that they do not singly prove the point in hand. Summing up the whole argument, the same authority continues: "In accordance with its resemblances with Romans and Second Corinthians, we must place its origin somewhat near the dates of those Epistles. In accordance with the 'so quickly' of 1:6, the reference of which is no doubt to the time of the conversion of the Galatians, but, conjoined with that, also to the time of his last seeing them, we must place it not too long after the Apostle's second visit. In accordance with its hints as to its place in the history of the Apostle's suffering, external or internal, we must place it almost contemporaneous with First Corinthians. And in accordance with some seeming allusions to it in First Corinthians (16:1; 9:2; 7:17; 4:17), we must place it before First Corinthians. We purpose, therefore, to assume provisionally that the Epistle was written at Ephesus, about, or somewhat earlier than the Passover of the year 57 A. D., and only a few weeks at most before First Corinthians. This

conclusion is not firm; it can be readily overturned by any real evidence to the contrary. But in the lack of decisive evidence either way, it appears to be the most probable conclusion attainable."

VI. Peculiarities.

It is especially noticeable that there are no commendatory words in this Epistle. The Apostle rushes *in medias res*, and this leaves no time for the words of commendation with which he usually prefaces his letters. But while there is great severity in this Epistle, there is still an undertone of tenderness as he strives to win the Galatians back to the simplicity and truth of the Gospel. This is the most controversial of all the Pauline Epistles.

It was this Epistle that was the inspiration of Martin Luther in the Reformation of which he was the great leader. Its great doctrine of justification by faith, so clearly set forth and so explicitly taught, led that mighty man out of the mazes of Romanism into the clear light of the Gospel.

Another peculiarity of the Epistle is brought out in the words of 6: 11, "Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand." The translation of the Authorized Version here is manifestly faulty, and that of the marginal reading of the Revised Version is a better rendering of the original, "See with how large letters I write unto you with mine own hand." The word translated "how large" denotes the size of the characters, and not the length of the whole Epistle. The Apostle usually availed himself of the services of an

amanuensis (Rom. 16:22; 1 Cor. 16:21; Col. 4:18; 2 Thess. 3:17), and added with his own hand only the concluding words of his Epistles. So at this point (6:11) he took the stylus from the hand of the amanuensis, and in bold characters wrote with his own hand the words of 6:11–18. The word translated "I write" is what is known as an epistolary aorist, and is conveniently translated by a present tense, marking the point at which the Apostle takes the pen in his own hand. Thus he himself adds the last words of the Epistle, writing them in large letters in order to make them more emphatic. The large characters also incidentally manifest the stress of feeling under which Paul was laboring at the time of the composition of this Epistle.

IV. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

I. Canonicity.

The canonicity of this Epistle is so well attested that there is absolutely no room for questioning it. Clement of Rome (96) quotes it by name in his letter to the Corinthians, ascribing it to Paul. Ignatius (115), Polycarp (116), Justin Martyr (145), Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195),—all these quote it, the latter three by name, ascribing it to the Apostle. Thus we have an unbroken line of witnesses to it from the last decade of the first century. And the *internal* evidence is just as strong and positive. The Apostle reveals himself at every step in the Epistle. Thus it claims to be by Paul, and its language and thoughts are so unmistakably Pauline that few critics have ever had

the hardihood to deny its Pauline authorship. Indeed there are so many allusions to the Apostle's movements, and so many expressions of his personal feelings abound throughout the whole Epistle, that its authenticity and genuineness are conclusively and absolutely established.

II. The Corinthian Church.

Corinth was one of the important cities of Paul's day. The city, however, that Paul knew was not the proud city that had stood at the head of the Achæan league. That old city was destroyed by the Romans in 146 B. C. Upon the ruins one hundred years later a new city arose under the fostering care of Julius Cæsar, who made it a Roman colony. It was situated on the isthmus connecting the Peloponnesus with Greece proper. It soon became, under its new auspices, a great commercial center on account of its commanding position on the great thoroughfare of commerce. Through its seaports, Lechæum and Cenchrea, the one on the west and the other on the east of the isthmus, which were connected by a ship-canal, the commerce of East and West continually passed. It became a great commercial center into which all nationalities flowed. Wealth and magnificence adorned it on every side. But its beauty was marred by the fact that its religions pandered to the basest passions of men. Celebrated for its splendor, it also became infamous on account of its frightful immorality. Its very name was the synonym for the worst forms of debauchery.

To this city the Apostle came late in the year 52 A. D.

Here he soon found congenial companions in the persons of Aquila and Priscilla, who as Jews had been expelled from Rome in accordance with the edict issued by the Emperor Claudius against the Jews residing in that city. These persons were tent-makers by trade, and were also very probably Christians. This community of occupation and faith, especially the latter, would operate to bind them very closely together. The Apostle worked at his trade in order to obtain his living, but at the same time he lost no opportunity of preaching Christ. Paul seems to have labored at first at Corinth under great depression of spirits. At length Silas and Timothy arrived from Macedonia. Their coming stimulated the great missionary to increased earnestness and activity. "And when Silas and Timothy were come from Macedonia, Paul was pressed in the spirit and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ" (Acts 18 : 5). This increased zeal aroused the slumbering opposition of the Corinthian Jews in whose Synagogue the Apostle had been preaching. They drove him from their place of worship, but this did not happen until a number of converts had been made, among whom was Crispus, the chief ruler of the Synagogue. Driven out of their Synagogue by the Jews, the Apostle turned his attention to the Gentiles. It was at this critical moment that the Lord appeared to Paul in a vision, and encouraged him by saying, "Be not afraid, but speak and hold not thy peace ; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee ; for I have much people in this city." Paul's continued success intensified the hostility of the Jews, and when Gallio,

the brother of the philosopher Seneca, became the deputy of Achaia, they thought that they could obtain from him a judgment that would silence the zealous Apostle. Their well-known failure (Acts 18 : 12–17) shows how they overreached themselves, and only contributed further success to the work of the missionaries, for the outcome of the whole affair was that Paul thenceforth had easier access to the Gentiles, who at the time rather espoused his cause on account of their own hatred of the Jews.

At the end of eighteen months, in the Spring of 54 A. D., the Apostle departed for Ephesus, leaving behind him in Corinth a flourishing Christian community. For some reason he took with him Aquila and Priscilla, whom he had led to a clearer perception of Christian truth. After a short stay in Ephesus, Aquila and Priscilla remaining there, Paul went to Jerusalem, his purpose being to attend the Feast of Pentecost, which occurred that year on May 31. From Jerusalem he went to Syrian Antioch where he spent a few weeks. Leaving Antioch, he started out on his third missionary journey, reaching Ephesus late in 54 A. D., where he remained until Pentecost 57 A. D., and from whence he wrote this First Epistle to the Corinthians.

The Church at Corinth was composed mainly of Gentiles. "The greater part of this Epistle has reference to questions that would naturally arise among Gentile converts; and Paul could say of the Church collectively, 'Ye know that ye were Gentiles, carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led'" (1 Cor. 12 : 2). With few exceptions these Christians were poor and unlearned

(1 : 26). Nor were there many of the higher ranks in life, except Crispus, the former ruler of the Synagogue, Erastus the City Chamberlain, and one Gaius. Sometime after Paul departed from Corinth, another prominent worker became associated with the Corinthian Church. Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew, who had previously become a disciple of John the Baptist, came to Ephesus. Aquila and Priscilla having come in contact with this man, gave him some needed instruction in Christian truth. Hearing from them of the Christian work in Corinth, he desired to assist in it. "And when he was disposed to pass into Achaia, the brethren (of Ephesus) wrote, exhorting the disciples (of Corinth) to receive him; who, when he was come, helped them much which believed through grace; for he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ" (Acts 18 : 24–28). This man's coming to Corinth was in many ways a great help, for he watered with his eloquence the seed that Paul had planted.

III. Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

Toward the close of his residence in Ephesus the Apostle received word of a very distressing state of affairs in Corinth. He doubtless was not wholly unprepared for the news, but members of the household of Chloe brought him a full account of affairs. Apollos seems to have returned to Ephesus at this juncture, and then a committee from the Corinthian Church, consisting of Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, waited upon the Apostle, bringing a letter in which were submitted to him for so-

lution some perplexing questions. Judaizing teachers had made their appearance in Corinth, and had set themselves at work to undermine Paul's authority; while the Church itself had become disturbed beyond measure. "The Church was split up into factions. Sins of uncleanness, so prevalent and regarded with indifference at Corinth, had polluted the Christian Church; the Christians had not completely cast off the old man; and especially an offense of this nature of a peculiarly aggravated description had occurred, and the offender had not been expelled from the Christian community. A litigious spirit had arisen. Disputes had been carried to such an extent, that Christian arbitration was rejected, and brother went to law with brother, and that before unbelievers. The religious assemblies of the Church frequently exhibited scenes of confusion; several prophesied at once; others spake with tongues, when there was no interpreter; women appeared in those assemblies in unbecoming attire; and even the Agapæ and the Lord's Supper were so profaned, that excess in eating and drinking was not unfrequent at their celebration. Several Christians, also, making a parade of their liberty, seem to have attended the sacrificial banquets held in the heathen temples. And there were some who went the length of denying or calling in question the doctrine of a resurrection,—perhaps even the idea of a future life." [16]

It is plain that a number of difficult questions were submitted to the Apostle for his judgment. And there was need for a clear and positive letter from the Apostle.

[16] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 179.

The object in view in writing this letter was twofold, namely: first, to correct the disorders that had arisen, and second, to answer the questions submitted to him. At the same time Paul embraces the opportunity for urging the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem.

As Timothy had been sent by Paul on some errand to Macedonia and Achaia (Acts 19:22) some time before this, it was manifest that he could not have been the bearer of this letter. And the references to Timothy in this letter make it plain that Paul did not expect that he would reach Corinth until after they had received it (4:17; 16:10). Judging from a reference in the Second Epistle (12:17, 18), Titus was the bearer of this Epistle. It is probable also that the three Corinthians, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, returned with him. The Apostle desired to have Apollos go with them, but for some reason, possibly he may have thought that his presence might aggravate the factious spirit there, he decided not to go at that time (16:12). Sosthenes, who is associated with Paul in the salutation of the Epistle, is unknown to us from any other source. The Corinthians doubtless had some acquaintance with him. He may have acted as Paul's amanuensis on this occasion.

IV. Outline of the Epistle.

The diversified contents of the Epistle make it difficult to give an outline, but the following will indicate the general contents of the Epistle:—

1. Greeting and thanksgiving. 1:1–9.

2. The party-spirit in the church, with a detailed justification of Paul's method of teaching. 1:10–4:21.

3. Disorders in the Church. 5 : 1–6 : 20.
   (1.) The incestuous offender. 5 : 1–13.
   (2.) Their lawsuits. 6 : 1–11.
   (3.) On impurity in general. 6 : 12–20.
4. Answers to inquiries in regard to, 7 : 1–15 : 58.
   (1.) Marriage. 7 : 1–40.
   (2.) Meats offered to idols, with digression as to the way he had acted. 8 : 1–9 : 27.
   (3.) Warnings against the abuse of their liberty. 10 : 1–33.
   (4.) Regulations for public worship. 11 : 1–14 : 40.
      (*a.*) As to head coverings. 11 : 1–16.
      (*b.*) As to the Agapæ and the Lord's Supper. 11 : 17–34.
      (*c.*) As to spiritual gifts, with digression in the magnificent eulogy on love (13 : 1–13). 12 : 1–14 : 40.
   (5.) The Resurrection. 15 : 1–58.
5. Directions as to the collections for the poor. 16 : 1–4.
6. Personal messages and exhortations. 16 : 5–18.
7. Salutations. 16 : 19, 20.
8. Autographic conclusion. 16 : 21–24.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

This is quite easily determined. When he wrote, he was expecting to remain at Ephesus until Pentecost. He was making his preparations to leave Ephesus to go to Macedonia and from thence to Corinth. He had been in Ephesus since late in 54 A. D., and he left that city immediately after Pentecost 57 A. D. In accordance with these facts the date of composition was a short time

previous to Pentecost of 57 A. D., and the place where it was written was Ephesus.

VI. Concluding Remarks.

This is an intensely practical Epistle, and it should be carefully studied for the light it throws upon the many questions that arise in regard to Christian conduct. It is the book in which to find instruction for all time on questions concerning Christian freedom and conduct. "The brevity and yet completeness with which intricate practical problems are discussed, the unerring firmness with which through all plausible sophistry and fallacious scruples the radical principle is laid hold of, and the sharp finality with which it is expressed, reveal not merely the bright-eyed sagacity and thorough Christian feeling of Paul, but also his measureless intellectual vigor, while such a passage as the thirteenth chapter betrays that strong and sane imagination which can hold in view a wide field of human life, and the fifteenth rises from a basis of keen cut and solidly laid reasoning to the most dignified and stirring eloquence. It was a happy circumstance for the future of Christianity that in these early days, when there were almost as many wild suggestions and foolish opinions as there were converts, there should have been this one clear practical judgment, the embodiment of Christian wisdom." [17]

In this Epistle the Apostle appears before us as a strange mixture of tenderness and severity. "At one time he rebukes with impassioned severity; at another he

[17] Dods' Introd. to the N. T., p. 103.

entreats with the tenderness of a loving mother mourning over her erring children." And nowhere does his princely intellect shine out more clearly than in some of the thrilling, soul-stirring passages of this Epistle. How many Christian graves have been made to appear as the gateway to heaven by the reading thereat of the fifteenth chapter! And where in all the range of human literature is to be found a passage equal to the description of love in the thirteenth chapter? And how often the sacramental hosts of God's elect have been thrilled by hearing read the words of institution, recorded in 11 : 23–29, as they approached the Lord's Table!

V. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

I. Canonicity.

The external testimony to this Epistle is not quite as strong as that to the First. It is, however, by no means weak, or even unsatisfactory. Polycarp (116) plainly quotes it. The writer of the Epistle to Diognetus (117), Theophilus of Antioch (168–182), Athenagoras (177), betray its influence on them. Marcion (130) included it in his list; so also is it found in the Muratori Canon (170). The Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions contain it. Then Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195), quote it by name as a genuine Pauline Epistle. The internal evidence is along the same line. The Epistle claims to be by Paul, and all of its historical allusions bear out this claim. "No one can read the two Epistles to the Corinthians with attention, without being satisfied that the writer of the

First was also the writer of the Second. The character of the author is the same: there is the same combination of severity and tenderness; at one time the stern reprover of sin, and at another the tender parent mourning over the delinquencies of his children; at one time threatening the Corinthians that if he should come again he would not spare (2 Cor. 13:2), and at another time writing unto them with many tears (2 Cor. 2:4). The style is undoubtedly that of Paul."[18] And this is rendered all the more certain by the manifest harmony between the statements made in the Acts and those in these two Epistles.[19] Indeed so closely are the two Epistles related, that the arguments in support of the First Epistle help to establish the Second as well. We may consider the position of this Epistle in the New Testament as impregnable.

II. To Whom Written.

The First Epistle is addressed "unto the church of God which is at Corinth . . . with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." A good deal of controversy has been waged over the meaning of this last clause; but, considering the special character of the Epistle, addressed as it was to the immediate condition of the Corinthians, it seems best to understand it "in a sense of topographical restriction to the province of Achaia." There was a church at Cenchrea (Rom. 16:1), one of the ports of Corinth, and there

[18] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 204.
[19] See Paley's Horæ Paulinæ.

doubtless were other churches in the same neighborhood. This Second Epistle is addressed "unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia." It is manifest that both of these Epistles were primarily intended for the church at Corinth; but if, as seems evident, there were other churches in close relation geographically and otherwise to the Corinthian church, there was need of including them in the salutations. Churches in such relation to the Corinthian church would be likely to have about the same needs as their mother-church had. This Epistle, accordingly, was addressed to the same circle of readers mentioned in the First Epistle.

III. The Occasion and Object of this Epistle.

The Apostle remained in Ephesus for a time after having sent his First Epistle to the Corinthians. Leaving Ephesus at length immediately after Pentecost 57 A. D., Paul journeyed to Troas. At this point he had expected to meet Titus on his way back from Corinth with a full account of the reception of the First Epistle by the Corinthian Christians. Great was his disappointment when Titus failed to appear. At length, although a door was opened to him at Troas to preach the Gospel, he pressed on across the Ægean Sea to Macedonia, hoping thereby to meet Titus all the sooner. His feverish anxiety to hear from Corinth would not permit him to remain at Troas, for, he says, "I had no rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother: but taking my leave of them [of Troas], I went from

thence into Macedonia" (2 Cor. 2:13). And even in Macedonia the same anxiety was upon him until Titus came. "For, when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears. Nevertheless God that comforteth those that are cast down, comforted us by the coming of Titus" (2 Cor. 7:5, 6). Just at what point Titus and Paul met, we have no means of telling. Immediately the Apostle wrote this Second Epistle which he sent by the hand of Titus who was accompanied by two others. "And we have sent with him the brother, whose praise is in the gospel throughout the churches" (8:18). It has been conjectured, and indeed we have an early tradition to this effect, that this person was none other than Luke the historian, who rejoined the Apostle when he reached Philippi on this his third journey. Luke remained at Philippi when Paul left that city on his second journey and very probably he spent the intervening time at that place. "And we have sent with them our brother whom we have oftentimes proved diligent in many things" (8:22). Who this third person was we have no means of telling. It may possibly have been either Apollos or Sosthenes.

It is to be noted that Timothy is associated with Paul in the salutations of this Epistle. From this fact it is evident that he had returned from his journey into Macedonia and Achaia (Acts 19:22; 1 Cor. 4:17). When the Apostle wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians, he expected that it would reach its destination before Timothy arrived there (1 Cor. 16:10; 4:17).

Here we have Timothy with Paul again. Some writers have advanced the idea that Timothy did not carry out the plan of the Apostle that he should go to Achaia as well as to Macedonia, but that he had rejoined Paul's company in Macedonia and had not gone to Achaia at all. The reason given for this idea is that Paul nowhere in this Epistle attributes his knowledge of Corinthian affairs to information derived from Timothy, but from Titus. But we have no evidence of Timothy's having failed to carry out Paul's plan for his movements as indicated in the First Epistle. Indeed if Timothy had failed to reach Corinth as promised in the First Epistle, it would have been necessary to explain this failure in this Epistle. It would only have given further occasion to Paul's enemies to accuse him of vacillation and failure to keep his promises, if Timothy, who is always so closely associated with him, had failed to go to Corinth. We must infer then that Timothy did go to Corinth. It is probable that he remained there but a short time, and departed again before the full effects of Paul's First Epistle were manifest. And the fact that he is associated with the Apostle in the greetings of this Epistle is sufficient reason for his naming Titus as the channel of his information. Timothy undoubtedly brought some news, but it was upon Titus, the bearer of the First Epistle, that Paul depended for full information.

This information brought by Titus was not altogether satisfactory. The majority of the church had submitted to the Apostle and were loyal to him once more; the chief offender against the purity of the church had been

excommunicated and had repented; and there was deep grief over the disorders that had arisen. But while the majority had submitted, there was still a vigorous faction that refused to recognize the Apostle's authority. These persons had trumped up new charges against Paul. "Their animosity to the Apostle was greater than when he wrote the First Epistle. They brought forward new charges. They accused Paul of lightness and irresolution, —changing his mind, purposing at one time to come and at another time resolving not to come, as if he were afraid (2 Cor. 1 : 16–18). They charged him with pride and arrogance,—seeking to exalt himself above them, and to exercise a dominion over their faith (2 Cor. 1 : 24). They insinuated that he was artful and cunning in his conduct (2 Cor. 12 : 16). They openly denied his apostleship, and refused to acknowledge his authority (2 Cor. 12 : 11, 12). And they contrasted the severity and boldness of his letters with the weakness and contemptible nature of his personal appearance"[20] (2 Cor. 10 : 10).

"The calumnies of his opponents had wounded him deeply, especially as they touched points where his best intentions had been twisted by them into the very opposite. He wrote under great excitement, the throbs of which are felt throughout the Epistle."[21] The purpose of the Apostle in writing this Second Epistle was to confirm and commend the obedient portion of the church, and also to meet and overthrow the charges and new insinuations of his enemies. He also used the oppor-

[20] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 211.
[21] Weiss' Introd., Vol. I., p. 285.

tunity for further directions and exhortations in regard to the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem. Meyer writes, "The aim of the Epistle is stated by Paul himself at 13 : 10, viz : to put the church before his arrival into that frame of mind which it was necessary that he should find, in order that he might thereupon set to work among them, not with stern, corrective authority, but for their edification. But in order to attain this aim, he had to make it his chief task to elucidate, confirm, and vindicate his apostolic authority, which, in consequence of his former letter, had been assailed still more vehemently, openly and influentially by his opponents. For if that were regained, if the church were again confirmed on that point, and the opposition defeated, every hindrance to his successful personal labor among them would be removed. With the establishment of his apostolic character and reputation, he is therefore chiefly occupied in the whole Epistle; everything else is only subordinate, including a detailed appeal respecting the collection." [22]

IV. The Outline of the Epistle.

This is even more difficult to give of this Epistle than it was of the former. Here the development of thought is not systematic and logical. The extremely personal character of the Epistle largely accounts for this. There are, however, three quite well marked main parts to it.

I. Hortatory. 1 : 1–7 : 16.
   1. Greeting and thanksgiving. 1 : 1–11.
   2. Reasons for the changes in his plans. 1 : 12–24.

[22] Meyer's Commentary on 2 Cor., p. 128.

3. Expressions of gratitude at their obedience and recommendation of restoration of the repentant offender. 2 : 1–11.
4. His great anxiety for them, until he heard from Titus about them. 2 : 12–17.
5. Contrasts the glorious nature of the Gospel with the law. 3 : 1–18.
6. Describes the difficulties encountered by himself. 4 : 1–15.
7. The future rewards, however, strengthened him. 4 : 16–5 : 13.
8. The love of Christ the mainspring of his life. 5 : 14–21.
9. Beseeches them to be pure and holy in their lives. 6 : 1–7 : 1.
10. Speaks again of his anxiety about them and the comfort Titus' message brought him. 7 : 2–16.

II. Directions about the collection and the matters of Christian giving generally. 8 : 1–9 : 15.

1. Informs them of the example of the Macedonians. 8 : 1–5.
2. The mission of Titus in regard to this collection. 8 : 6–24.
3. Exhorts them to be ready with their offering. 9 : 1–15.

III. Severe and threatening vindication of himself to the impenitent portion of the Church. 10 : 1–13 : 14.

1. Answers the slanders of his opponents, and details with reluctance what he had suffered for Christ, and tells of the special revelations given to him. 10 : 1–12 : 10.
2. Continues his personal defense. 12 : 11–21.
3. Announces his coming to them. 13 : 1.
4. Tells them that he will not spare them if he found need for severity. 13 : 2–10.
5. Farewell exhortation and salutation. 13 : 11–13.
6. Apostolic benediction. 13 : 14.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

The First Epistle was written at Ephesus, sometime between Passover and Pentecost of 57 A. D. This Second Epistle followed it after an interval of a few weeks, or at most a few months. It was written from some point in Macedonia, very probably not at Philippi, as we have no reason for believing that Titus met Paul there. There would doubtless have been some reference to Philippi in the Epistle, if it had been written from that place. It was the original plan of the Apostle to go from Ephesus direct to Corinth and from thence to Macedonia. But when he heard from Corinth in regard to the sad state of affairs there, it seemed best to defer his visit until he had re-established his authority among them by his letter (2 Cor. 1 : 15, 16, 23). When he wrote his First Epistle, he said, "Now I will come unto you when I shall pass through Macedonia, for I do pass through Macedonia. And it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you, that ye may bring me on my journey whithersoever I go. For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry awhile with you, if the Lord permit" (1 Cor. 16 : 5–7). This is the announcement of the change in his plans, and in 2 Cor. 1 : 15, 16, 23, he explains this change of plans. Paul departed then from Ephesus after Pentecost 57 A. D. (1 Cor. 16 : 8), and passed by way of Troas into Macedonia. It was somewhere in that province that he met Titus, and he immediately wrote this Epistle, that is, during the latter part of the Summer of 57 A. D. In his Epistle to the Romans, written in February, 58

A. D., he speaks of having preached the Gospel of Christ round about unto Illyricum (Rom. 15:19). It was during this same Summer and the subsequent Fall that he did this, arriving finally at Corinth about December, 57 A. D., where he spent the following three months (Acts 20:2, 3).

VI. Conclusion.

There are two other questions involved in the study of the Epistles to the Corinthians, that demand some consideration.

1. Did Paul visit Corinth a second time before writing his Epistles to the Christians of that city? So far as the book of the Acts is concerned there is nothing even to suggest this question, for it seems on the contrary to preclude the possibility of a visit there during the three years' residence in Ephesus. But when we examine certain references in the Second Epistle (2:1; 12:14; 13:1), we are led to ask whether Paul did not make a visit to Corinth that is not recorded in the Acts. In 13:2 we read, "I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the *second* time; . . . that if I come again, I will not spare." If this translation is correct, the approaching visit would be the second, but if we adopt the rendering of the Revised Version, which reads, "I have said beforehand, and I do say beforehand, as when I was present the second time," etc., the approaching visit would be the third. Some maintain that when Paul says, "This is the third time I am coming to you," he means that it was the third time he was *ready* to do so, but that he did

not actually go a second time until after these letters were written. But in 2 Cor. 2:1 he writes, "I determined this with myself that I would not come again to you in heaviness." When did he go to them in heaviness? This could not have been at the time of his first visit, for this heaviness was occasioned by the conduct of the Corinthians. It is true that he seems to have been depressed in spirit when he went to Corinth from Athens on his second missionary journey (Acts 18:5), but this depression, if there was any, was not caused by the Corinthians. Now it seems from all these passages that the approaching visit would be the third. But when was the second made? It must have been before the composition of the First Epistle. The means of communication between Ephesus and Corinth were easy and numerous. Paul very probably heard such unsatisfactory news from Corinth that some time during his Ephesian residence he took a hurried and brief trip there. At that time in great grief he had tried mild measures for the correction of the abuses that were spreading. That visit had been a painful one to him, and it had been a time of humiliation. But those mild measures had not been successful, and when he learned this he wrote his letters, in the latter of which, he informed them plainly that when he came again he would not spare, that he would be as severe as the occasion demanded.[23]

2. Another question of interest here is whether Paul

[23] In support of this unrecorded visit are the following writers: Conybeare, Ellicott, Wieseler, Meyer, Alford, Olshausen, Reuss, and others.

wrote a letter to the Corinthians that we do not now possess. In 1 Cor. 5 : 9 the Apostle says, " I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators." But where does he write this? It cannot mean in this First Epistle, for no such command can be found in it. The most natural understanding is that Paul did write a letter to Corinth in regard to the special evil in their church. This letter is not preserved to us. It may have been a brief note in which the Apostle enjoined separation from profligate people, and in it he may have announced his purpose to visit them first before he should go into Macedonia.

This letter reveals to us more of the character of the Apostle than any other. It may seem at times almost egotistical, but Paul was not led to write as he did by any unworthy motives. The circumstances compelled his writing such a letter. He had to defend himself against malicious attacks, and in doing so he gives us that wonderful catalogue of his sufferings and trials for Christ in 11 : 23–33. That record shows us how little we do actually know of the Apostle's stormy and heroic life. In this letter we can almost hear his heart beat. " None of his other letters give us so clear a view of his noble, tender heart, the sufferings and joys of his inward life, his alternations of feelings, his anxieties and struggles for the welfare of his churches. These were his daily and hourly care, as his children whom he had brought forth in travail; and the mortification their conduct had caused him, far from cooling his affection for them, only inflamed his love and his holy zeal for

their eternal salvation."[24] "The First Epistle to the Corinthians shows us how he applied the principles of Christianity to daily life in dealing with the flagrant aberrations of a most unsatisfactory Church: his Second Epistle to the Corinthians opens a window into the very emotions of his heart, and is the agitated self-defense of a wounded and loving spirit to ungrateful and erring, yet not wholly lost, or wholly incorrigible souls."[25]

VI. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

I. Canonicity.

This is one of the best attested books in the New Testament. According to De Wette its authenticity is raised above all doubt. The external testimony begins with Clement of Rome (96), and includes Ignatius (115), Polycarp (116), The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120), Aristides (138–161), Justin Martyr (145), Marcion (130), Muratori Canon (170), Theophilus of Antioch (168), Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), Clement of Alexandria (195). There are nineteen witnesses to it before the beginning of the third century, including not only orthodox writers, but also heretics, who use the Epistle as authoritative Scripture, and all the late writers ascribe it to Paul. "The internal evidence of its genuineness has carried conviction to the minds of the most cautious and the most skeptical critics. Every chapter, in fact, bears the impress of the same mind from which the Epistles to the churches of Corinth and Galatia undoubtedly pro-

[24] Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, Vol. I., p. 344.
[25] Farrar's Life and Work of St. Paul, chap. 33.

ceeded; and even Baur and the critics of his school who make every effort to prove the last two chapters spurious, are obliged to admit that the rest of the Epistle is the genuine work of St. Paul." [26] Bleek says, "The genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans cannot be disputed on any reasonable grounds; it is conclusively established both by its internal character and by external witnesses. It never was suspected in the early Church; on the contrary, we have the earliest traces of its being recognized and used as a work of the Apostle Paul's in Clemens Romanus and Polycarp, and even in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and perhaps in the First Epistle of St. Peter." [27]

Objections have been raised as to the integrity of the letter, and some reject the last two chapters, claiming that the benediction of 16:25–27 really belongs at the end of the fourteenth chapter. As to the fifteenth chapter, however, it can be said with confidence that "the result of modern criticism has been to prove beyond reasonable doubt that it is both the genuine work of Paul, and an original portion of the Roman Epistle." Against 16:3–24 it has been argued that as Paul had never been at Rome, he could not possibly have known so many of the Roman Christians. One writer has propounded the theory that this section really was written by Paul, but at a later date, after the first Roman imprisonment, which was his earliest opportunity of forming so many acquaintances among them. This writer holds that this section was afterwards added to this Epistle. There are twenty-six

[26] Gifford in Bible Commentary.
[27] Bleek's Introd. to N. T., p. 447.

persons named in this section, and Prof. Gifford argues[28] that Paul could not have known all these at the time of the composition of this Epistle. When Paul left Ephesus just after Pentecost in 57 A. D., Aquila and Priscilla were there. But in this section the Church that is in their house is saluted. Can we suppose, it is asked, that they went away from Ephesus so soon after Paul's departure, and had gone to Rome? But in regard to them it is to be remembered that Rome was their home, and that having been expelled from that city by the edict of the Emperor Claudius, they would doubtless return again as soon as they could. Furthermore it is to be noted that Paul evidently names *all* the persons he knew who were in Rome. He had labored in commercial centers and among the working classes, and he could not help meeting as many as he names. People were constantly traveling between Rome and the provinces, and Paul would meet any Christians who happened to come to the cities where he was preaching. Andronicus and Junia he calls, "my fellow-prisoners" (16:7). In 2 Cor. 11:23 he speaks of "prisons more frequent." Who can say that they had not been imprisoned with Paul on one of these occasions? And as to the warnings against false teachers (16:17–20), they need occasion no special remark in view of the experiences the Apostle had already had in Galatia and Corinth.

Doubtless one cause of the discussions over these last two chapters is found in the fact that the benediction is placed by some authorities at the end of the fourteenth

[28] Prof. Gifford in the Bible Commentary.

chapter. But all the great MSS. and the Latin Fathers place it where it is now found, and with them the great textual critics agree.[29] None of the MSS. omit the benedictions entirely, they only differ as to the proper place for them. But despite these objections the integrity of the Epistle as it now stands is certain. The real facts in the case establish this beyond the possibility of a doubt.

And in view of what has been said the Pauline authorship is established. It claims to be by Paul, and there is not a single argument that can be successfully urged against the faith of the Church. It is Pauline in language and matter, and its historical references harmonize with all known facts of the life of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

II. The Roman Church.

The origin of this church cannot now be discovered. The Roman Catholic Church claims that Peter founded it in the second year of the Emperor Claudius (42 A. D.), and that he presided over it as its bishop for twenty-five years. This claim, however, is negatived by several facts. In this Epistle no reference is made to Peter. Surely if Peter had been at the head of this church for fifteen years when Paul wrote this Epistle, he would have at least mentioned his name. And if he had been there, what occasion would there have been for Paul to write to that church, for it was not his custom to build on another man's foundation? But there is not the slightest intima-

[29] Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort.

tion in the New Testament that Peter ever visited Rome. On the contrary, there are many things to indicate that he spent his life in Judea and the far East. In 44 A. D., he was imprisoned in Jerusalem by Herod Agrippa. In 50 A. D., he was in the same city when the council was called to consider the questions sent in from Antioch. In 64 A. D., he wrote his First Epistle from Babylon. Then in not one of the Epistles that Paul wrote from Rome during his first imprisonment there does he in any way refer to Peter as being in Rome. All these facts are in absolute conflict with the tradition that Peter founded this church.

But the Gospel must have reached Rome at an early date. On the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended on the waiting disciples, there were present among others in Jerusalem "strangers of Rome." It is not unreasonable to suppose that some of them were converted under the searching preaching of Peter on that day, and that they on their return carried the Gospel to Rome. We know that there was a very large Jewish population in Rome, and the contact between Jerusalem and Rome was so constant that it would be impossible for the knowledge of the Christian faith not to reach Rome. "Whether this can be accounted for by the presence of Roman pilgrims at the first Christian Pentecost (Acts 2 : 10), or by the dispersion that followed the first persecution of the Christians (8 : 1 ; 11 : 19), is quite a matter of indifference ; the ways that led Roman Jews to Jerusalem or to other places where there were Jewish Christian churches, and believing Jews to Rome, are too

many to permit of their being taken into special consideration. The idea that a church of believers could not originate without actual apostolic agency is quite unhistorical." [30]

Some of those saluted by the Apostle in this letter were Christians before he was (16 : 7). There are references to three different places of meeting for worship (16 : 5, 14, 15), although we cannot affirm absolutely that there was a fully organized Church in the eternal city. The faith and obedience of these Roman Christians were well known (1 : 8; 16 : 19). All these things go to show that the Gospel had been doing its divine work in Rome for many years. It does not militate against this that the Jews who waited on Paul after his arrival in Rome in the Spring of 61 A. D., professed or affected to be ignorant of the Christian faith. So far as the Jews were concerned, the Christians were indeed everywhere spoken against. Furthermore the Jews of Rome were as a rule active business people, and in their business haunts in so large a city as Rome, might have had but little contact with Christianity. And for this reason they might actually have had but little beyond hearsay knowledge of Christian truth and people. Men engrossed in the pursuit of the things of this life do not generally have much personal acquaintance with religious matters.

As to the composition of the Roman church we cannot positively affirm anything. There are passages which seem to point to a Jewish character in the church there. On the other hand there are passages that all but assert

[30] Weiss' Introd., Vol. I., p. 295.

its Gentile character (1 : 5, 6; 1 : 13; 11 : 13; 15 : 15, 16). It seems most probable that the predominating element in its composition was Gentile. Prof. Jowett affirms that "the Roman church appeared to be at once Jewish and Gentile — Jewish in feeling, Gentile in origin."

III. Occasion and Design of the Epistle.

Before leaving Ephesus, and while contemplating a trip through Macedonia and Achaia and from thence to Jerusalem, Paul said, "After I have been there, I must also see Rome." In this Epistle he writes, "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (1 : 13), having a great desire these many years to come unto you" (15 : 23). No more important point for the spread of the Gospel could be occupied than it was, and the Apostle recognized that fact. It was natural then that he should desire to go to that city, and that he should attempt meanwhile to mould the beliefs of the Christians there. But the way had not yet been opened up for him to go there in person. And when he heard that Phœbe, a deaconess of the church of Cenchrea, the eastern seaport of Corinth, was about to go to Rome, he determined to do the next best thing and send a letter to them by her hand. It was a most favorable opportunity for him to communicate with them. The occasion of the letter consequently was the proposed visit of Phœbe to Rome, together with his own long-seated desire to visit that city himself.

It is by no means as easy to determine exactly the object Paul had in view in writing this Epistle. Upon

this point there is a great diversity of opinion among scholars. No heresy is combated in the Epistle, and as yet there were no disorders in the Roman church to reform. The intention of the Apostle to visit Rome as soon as possible after his prospective journey to Jerusalem may have led him to consider it advisable to prepare the Christians of that city for his visit by means of a letter. But this could not have been the main purpose he had. Dr. Gloag writes: "The object of the letter was general, not special. Paul had no special errors to correct, no disorders to reform. The Roman church was not connected with him, as other churches, by direct personal visitation. The design of the Epistle was to impart to the Roman Christians a correct view of Christianity. This with several minute variations, is the opinion adopted by De Wette, Olshausen, Tholuck, and Alford." "The Epistle to the Romans," observes De Wette, "is the only Epistle of the Apostle wherein he designedly represents his doctrine in its full connection, while in his other Epistles he takes cognizance of peculiar wants, doubts, and errors, and presupposes the knowledge of his doctrine." The theme or subject-matter of the Epistle is supposed to be expressed at its commencement; and the whole Epistle is a proof or development of that theme, namely, that 'the Gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile'" (Rom. 1 : 16). Professor Beet affirms that Paul's purpose in this letter is "to assert, and logically develop, the new doctrines; to show that they harmonize with God's declarations and conduct

as recorded in the Old Testament; and to apply them to matters of secular and Church life."

IV. The Outline of the Epistle.

The following is a brief outline given by Prof. Warfield:—

I. Introduction (1 : 1–17) in which the theme of the Epistle is brought forth as *Salvation by a God-provided righteousness attainable by all who believe.*

II. Doctrinal development and defense of this theme. 1 : 18–11 : 36.

1. The absolute necessity of such a method of justification; true of
   (*a*) the Gentiles (1 : 18–32), and
   (*b*) the Jews (2 : 1–3 : 20).
2. The positive exposition and proof of this method of justification. 3 : 21–5 : 21.
   (*a*) Exposition of its nature. 3 : 21–31.
   (*b*) Proof of the doctrine. 4 : 1–5 : 21.
3. Blessed moral effects of this method of justification. 6 : 1–8 : 39.
   (*a*) In its relation to sin. 6 : 1–23.
   (*b*) In its relation to law. 7 : 1–13.
   (*c*) In its relation to sinful habit. 7 : 14–25.
   (*d*) In its relation to the Christian's security. 8 : 1–39.
4. External effects of the application of this method of justification. 9 : 1–11 : 36.
   (*a*) Expression of grief at the Jews' rejection, 9 : 1–5,
   (*b*) which rejection is not inconsistent with God's character and promises, 9 : 6–24, for
   (*c*) the whole case was foretold by prophecy, 9 : 25–29. Hence he gives

(*d*) a clear statement of the effects of this rejection, 9 : 30–10 : 21, and

(*e*) defends this rejection. 11 : 1–36.

III. Exhortations based on the foregoing doctrine. 12 : 1–15 : 13.

IV. Conclusion. 15 : 14–16 : 27.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

From what has been written, it is evident that the letter was written at Corinth. During his former visit to Corinth the Apostle abode with Aquila and Priscilla, working for his own support (Acts 18 : 3). During this second visit he was the guest of Gaius (Rom. 16 : 23), one of his Corinthian converts (1 Cor. 1 : 14). When he wrote this Epistle, he had in his keeping the offering for the poor saints at Jerusalem which had been made by the Macedonian and Achaian churches (Rom. 15 : 26, 27). It is evident then that this Epistle was written after First Corinthians; for in that Epistle he gave directions in regard to this same collection, which so far as the Corinthians were concerned, was not then completed (1 Cor. 16 : 1, 2). He had now reached Corinth, had received their offering, and was on the eve of his departure to Jerusalem with it. This letter was written then during the three winter months of 57–58 A. D. It had been the Apostle's plan to take shipping at Corinth for the East, but the discovery of a plot against his life led him to take the overland route to Philippi (Acts 20 : 3), where he spent the Passover (Acts 20 : 6), which occurred that year on March 27, A. D. And as this Epistle was appar-

ently written just before his departure from Corinth, it is doubtless correct to date it during February of 58 A. D. Phœbe, the deaconess of the church of Cenchrea, was the bearer of this Epistle, as she was on the point of going to Rome to attend to some private business (Rom. 16 : 1, 2), and her journey thither, as we have seen, was in part the occasion of the Apostle's writing. Tertius, of whom we know nothing, was Paul's amanuensis on this occasion (Rom. 16 : 22).

VI. Peculiarities of the Epistle.

The more formal dogmatic character of this Epistle distinguishes it from all the other Pauline Epistles. Bishop Wordsworth says that "the great character of the Epistle is its universality." Dr. Gifford writes that here Paul sets forth "a full and systematic statement of those fundamental principles of the Gospel, which render it the one true religion for all the nations of the earth, and meet especially those deepest wants of human nature, which Judaism could not satisfy,—righteousness in the sight of God, and deliverance from the power of sin and death."

This Epistle is the masterpiece of the great Apostle, in which he elaborates the doctrines of Salvation, and sets forth in clearest light the means of man's justification in the sight of God. It is soteriological rather than christological. But it is no mere dry and formal statement of doctrine. In its eighth chapter we meet one of the grandest portions in all the range of literature. Of the whole letter Martin Luther wrote, "This Epistle is

the true masterpiece of the New Testament, and the very purest Gospel, which is well worthy and deserving that a Christian man should not only learn it by heart, word for word, but also that he should daily deal with it as with the daily bread of men's souls. For it never can be too much or too well read or studied; and the more it is handled, the more precious it becomes, and the better it tastes."

2. The Epistles of the Captivity.

We now come to that group of the Pauline Epistles known as the Epistles of the Captivity. Of these there are four, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians. They were written during the two years of Paul's first Roman imprisonment mentioned in Acts 28: 30. A period of over four years intervenes between the composition of the Epistle to the Romans and these. It is impossible to tell definitely their order in time of composition, except that Philippians, as we will notice hereafter, was probably written last. The Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians were dispatched at the same time by the hand of Tychicus, and he was accompanied on the same trip by Onesimus who had in his keeping the Epistle to Philemon. Paul was dwelling in his own hired house in the region of the Prætorium, bound night and day to a Roman soldier. Freedom of access to the Apostle seems, however, to have been granted to all who desired to see him. That house was therefore a perfect hive of Christian activity, from which and to which the workers were continually going and coming, on their errands to and from those churches

which were Paul's daily care (2 Cor. 11 : 28). Perplexed elders came there to consult the great Apostle concerning the affairs of their various churches. Thus though a prisoner and closely confined, the Apostle was in constant touch with scores of churches by means of the consecrated workers who came to seek his advice, or went forth in accordance with his directions. And from his house proceeded streams of influence that touched countless numbers of lives. Though he was in bonds, the word of God was not bound. We will now proceed to the study of these four letters, written from that "hired house" in Rome.

VII. THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

I. Canonicity.

When the early Christian writings are examined, we do not find in them any sure quotations of this Epistle until we come to Aristides (138–161) and Justin Martyr (145). There are, however, manifest echoes of it in Clement of Rome (96), Barnabas (106), and Ignatius (115). Marcion (130) places it in his list, and it is to be found in the Muratori Canon (170), as well as in the old Latin (160) and Syriac (170) Versions. It is quoted by name by Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195). From this it is evident that the *external* evidence in support of it is incontrovertible. And the *internal* evidence is by no means defective. It claims to be by Paul (1 : 1 ; 4 : 18). And this claim is borne out by the whole Epistle, its historical allusions and literary character. "The character of Paul is discernible

in the writer; his anxiety for the spiritual welfare of the Colossians (1 : 9; 2 : 5); his gratitude to God for the good report which he had received of their faith and love (1 : 4); his earnest desire for their spiritual improvement and increased holiness (1 : 9, 10); his liberality and freedom from cardinal ordinances (2 : 16); and his solicitude for an interest in their prayers (4 : 3). The style, also, with some variations, accounted for by the nature of the subject, is decidedly Pauline." [31]

Of course there have been found those who assail this Epistle, affirming that it is un-Pauline in language, style, and matter; and that it combats a species of heresy that did not arise until after Paul's day. But Bishop Ellicott says that "no doubts have been urged that deserve any serious consideration." [32] It was not until 1838 that this Epistle was called in question by any one. But Meyer affirms that "the fabrication of such an Epistle would be more marvelous than its originality." [33] And Renan, who assuredly cannot be accused of partiality to the Scriptures, writes, "This Epistle is to be received unhesitatingly as the work of St. Paul." Considering all the evidence obtainable, we cannot but feel that its authenticity and genuineness are conclusively proved.

II. The Church at Colossæ.

Colossæ, more popularly known in Paul's day as Colassæ, had been a city of considerable size and importance,

[31] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 265.
[32] Com. on Col., Introd.
[33] Com. on Col., p. 247.

according to the testimony of Herodotus and Xenophon. Its neighboring cities, Hierapolis and Laodicea, however, had outstripped it in the race for supremacy, and in apostolic times it had lost much of its former glory and prestige. It was situated in the province of Phrygia in the Lycus valley, on the river bearing that name which pours into the Mæander. To-day its exact site is largely a matter of conjecture. Lightfoot tells us that "not a single event in Christian history is connected with its name; and its very existence is only rescued from oblivion, when at long intervals some bishop of Colossæ attaches his signature to the decree of an ecclesiastical synod."[34] Earthquakes, to which the whole region is subject, together with the calcareous deposits of the river, have helped to obliterate the ruins of that once important city. The church at Colossæ was doubtless the least in importance of all the churches to which the Apostle addressed an Epistle.

The church at this place was not established by Paul, as is manifest from his words, "For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh." On his second and third missionary journeys the Apostle passed somewhat to the north of Colossæ and Laodicea, and up to the time of the writing of this Epistle he had not visited that region. While Paul labored in Ephesus (54–57 A. D.), he had been so successful that his great Ephesian enemy, Demetrius the silversmith, had said to his fellow-workmen of Ephesus, "that

[34] Lightfoot on Col., p. 70.

not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands," etc. (Acts 19 : 26). This Epistle speaks of Epaphras in such a way as to imply that he had founded the Colossian church (1 : 7). In all probability this man had come under the influence of Paul's preaching at Ephesus, for the Acts tells us (19 : 10) " that all they which were in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus." Epaphras was a Colossian (4 : 12), and it was to him that the Colossians owed their knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ (1 : 7). But this man Epaphras did not limit his labors for Christ to his own city Colossæ, for he apparently was also the founder of the churches of Hierapolis and Laodicea (4 : 13). His was the consuming zeal of those early disciples, who in their intense devotion for Christ, did not stop to count the cost of His service. In the Epistle to Philemon, Epaphras is called by Paul " my fellow-prisoner in Christ " (Philemon 23). Probably his relations with Paul had caused suspicions against him, and this may have led to his detention for a time at least as a prisoner with Paul at Rome.

Philemon, to whom Paul addressed one of his letters, was also a Colossian. He was a man of considerable means, and he with his wife provided in their commodious house a meeting place for the Colossian church. Their son Archippus, to whom in this Epistle an exhortation to renewed faithfulness is addressed (4 : 17), was probably the resident minister of the Colossian church, although some believe that his ministry was exercised at Laodicea,

because of the fact that the charge to him follows the injunction in regard to their having this Epistle read to the church of that city (4:16, 17).

The Colossian church was mainly Gentile in its composition (1:21, 27; 2:11), although the dangerous heresy threatening them was of Jewish origin. There were unquestionably some Jewish members in it, but in the main they were Gentiles. The heresy that was securing a hold among them was "(1) a combination of angel-worship and asceticism; (2) a self-styled philosophy or gnosis which depreciated Christ; (3) a rigid observance of Jewish festivals and sabbaths. The most probable view, therefore, seems to be that some Alexandrian Jews had appeared at Colossæ, professing a belief in Christianity, and imbued with the Greek "philosophy" of the school of Philo, but combining with it the Rabbinical theosophy and angelology which afterwards was embodied in the Kabbala, and an extravagant asceticism, which afterwards distinguished several sects of the Gnostics."[35]

III. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

The occasion of this Epistle is unquestionably to be found in the visit of Epaphras to Paul. This zealous Christian seems to have made the journey to Rome for the special purpose of securing the advice of the great Apostle. It was from him that Paul learned all about the condition of the Colossian church, from him he heard of their faith in Christ Jesus and love to all the saints (Col.

[35] Conybeare & Howson's Life of Paul, Vol. II., p. 383.

1 : 4). This faithful worker informed the Apostle of all the commendable features of the Colossian church. But while there was not a little in the report to please Paul, there were other things sufficiently grave to cause him great concern. An insidious and dangerous heresy was beginning to threaten the very existence of the church there. The leaders of this heresy were evidently Jewish Christians, the influence of whose teachings was on the increase. It is noticeable that these heretics were not like the Judaizing teachers with whom Paul had had to deal in other places. Here they made no assault on the Apostle's authority, but contented themselves with heretical teachings as described above.

The object of the Epistle, according to Bishop Ellicott, was "an earnest desire on the part of the Apostle to warn the Colossians against a system of false teaching, partly oriental and theosophistic in its character (2 : 18), and partly Judaical and ceremonial (2 : 16), which was tending on the one hand to obscure the majesty and glory of Christ (1 : 15 ; 2 : 8), and, on the other hand, to introduce ritualistic observances, especially on the side of bodily austerities (2 : 16–23), opposed alike to the simplicity and freedom of the Gospel, and to all true and vital union with the risen Lord (2 : 19 ; 3 : 1)." The main design of the Epistle consequently was to refute these heretical ideas, and to warn the Colossian Christians against them. The supreme glory of Christ is the principal theme of this christological Epistle.

The bearer of the Epistle was Tychicus, whom he describes as "a beloved brother, and a faithful minister

and fellow-servant in the Lord; whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose [that of declaring Paul's condition], that he might know your estate and comfort your hearts" (4: 7, 8). Accompanying him was Onesimus. Between them they were to tell the Colossians "all things which are done here."

IV. Outline of the Epistle.

I. Introduction. 1 : 1–13.
  1. Salutation. 1 : 1, 2.
  2. Thanksgiving. 1 : 3–8.
  3. Prayer. 1 : 9–12. Transition to main theme. 1 : 13.

II. Doctrinal portion on the Person and Work of Christ. 1 : 13–2 : 3.
  1. Redemption through the Son of God. 1 : 13, 14.
  2. The dignity of His Person. 1 : 15–19.
    (*a.*) The head of all creation. 1 : 15–17.
    (*b.*) The head of the church. 1 : 18, hence
    (*c.*) His pre-eminence. 1 : 19.
  3. His Work. 1 : 20–2 : 3.
    (*a.*) General description of it as a work of reconciliation. 1 : 20.
    (*b.*) Its relation to the Colossians. 1 : 21–23.
    (*c.*) The Apostle's part in this work, 1 : 24–27, including his anxiety for all men, 1 : 28, 29, but especially for those to whom he is writing. 2 : 1–3.

III. Polemical Portion, consisting of warnings. 2 : 4–23.
  1. Not to permit any one to deceive them, but to cleave to Christ, walking in Him. 2 : 4–7.

2. "Let not worldly wisdom lead you away from Him, who is the Head of all, who has quickened you, and forgiven you, and triumphed over all the powers of evil." 2 : 8–15.
3. "Let no man judge you in ceremonial observances, holding not the Head. Submit not to outward austerities that are inwardly vain and carnal." 2 : 16–23.

IV. Hortatory Portion, consisting of exhortations and injunctions. 3 : 1–4 : 6.

1. To show their union with the risen Christ. 3 : 1–4.
2. To put off the old nature. 3 : 5–11.
3. To practice Christian graces. 3 : 12–17.
4. Special injunctions. 3 : 18–4 : 6, concerning
   (*a.*) Wives and husbands. 3 : 18, 19.
   (*b.*) Children and parents. 3 : 20, 21.
   (*c.*) Slaves and masters. 3 : 22–4 : 1.
   (*d.*) Prayer and thanksgiving. 4 : 2–4.
   (*e.*) Conduct and speech. 4 : 5, 6.

V. Personal messages. 4 : 7–18.

1. Commendation of Tychicus and Onesimus. 4 : 7–9.
2. Salutations. 4 : 10–15.
3. Messages relating to the Laodicean church and to Archippus. 4 : 16, 17.
4. Farewell salutation in Paul's own handwriting. 4 : 18.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

There is almost unanimous agreement among scholars that Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon were written at the same time, that Tychicus carried the first two to

their respective destinations on the same trip, and that he was accompanied by the converted slave Onesimus, who bore the letter to Philemon. But there is some difference of opinion among critics as to whether they were written during the Cæsarean (58–60 A. D.), or during the Roman imprisonment (61–63 A. D.). Meyer and others have strenuously contended that they were written at Cæsarea. If they are correct, then these Epistles were written between Pentecost 58 A. D. and the early Autumn of 60 A. D. But the large majority of critics assign them to the Roman imprisonment between the Spring of 61 A. D. and the Summer of 63 A. D. Without entering fully into the discussion of this question, which is really not one of vital importance, it may be well to note some arguments to be advanced in support of their composition at Rome.

(1.) Colossians and Ephesians were written at the same time as the Epistle to Philemon, and the bearers of these letters went together to Colossæ (Col. 4 : 7–9; Eph. 6 : 21, 22; Philemon 10–21). Now it is far more likely that Onesimus, when he ran away from his master Philemon, would go to Rome than to Cæsarea. Rome was the great hiding place for fugitive slaves. How unlikely that he would go to a small city such as Cæsarea! How much more probable that he would hasten to the eternal city, with all of its attractions for men of his stamp!

(2.) They were not written at Cæsarea, because Paul does not seem to have labored there as he could and did at Rome (Acts 28 : 31; Col. 4 : 3, 4), and also "because he could not have expected at Cæsarea to be coming

to Phrygia (Acts 23:11; 19:21; Rom. 1:13; Acts 20:25), whereas while writing to Philemon he expected soon to visit Phrygia (Philemon 22)."[36] At Rome, while he was a prisoner, Paul dwelt in his own hired house, receiving "all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." But at Cæsarea he was in prison, and his every movement was watched by the Jews, who would not permit such free preaching.

(3.) The companions of Paul that are mentioned in these Epistles fit Rome better than Cæsarea. We have no evidence that Aristarchus was in prison at Cæsarea with Paul (Col. 4:10), but both he and Luke went to Rome with the Apostle (Acts 27:2).

In view of these facts with the majority of scholars we assign all of these Epistles to the Roman captivity. Their relative order is unimportant. They were all written at the same time, except that to the Philippians, which came a little later, as we shall see when that Epistle is considered in its order. To fix the date of one of the three is to fix the date of all. The abrupt ending of the book of Acts seems to imply that at the end of the two years mentioned, there was a change in Paul's affairs. This change is believed to have resulted in his release. It was in the Spring of 61 A. D. that Paul arrived at Rome from the island of Malta, where he had been shipwrecked the preceding Winter. He was probably released in the Summer of 63 A. D. In accordance with this I would

[36] Conybeare and Howson's St. Paul, Vol. II., p. 384, foot-note.

date these three Epistles (Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians) in the latter part of 62 A. D., or possibly early in 63 A. D.

VI. Peculiarities of the Epistles.

The peculiar similarity between this Epistle and that to the Ephesians will be considered in connection with the latter. One thing to be especially noticed in this Epistle is its special christological character. It deals specifically with the person and work of Christ. It has a large number of once-used (hapax legomena) words. The peculiar object of the letter occasions this, many of them being called into use in combating the Colossian heresy. The passage in which the pre-eminence of Christ (1 : 15–19) is set forth is worthy of the closest study.

VIII. THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

I. Canonicity.

When the brevity and character of this incomparable Epistle is considered, it need not be surprising that we find very few citations from, or references to, it in the early Christian writings. As a short personal letter with no distinctive doctrinal passages, it furnished very little matter for quotations. But even though this is true, yet external testimony to it is not lacking. There is possibly a reference to it in Ignatius (115), but this is uncertain. It was contained in Marcion's Catalogue (130), as well as in the Muratori Canon (170). It is found also in the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions. Tertullian (190) specifically speaks of it as having escaped

the falsifying hand of Marcion, who received it, but rejected the Pastoral Epistles. This testimony, according to De Wette, establishes its genuineness beyond doubt.

As to the internal evidence, the following words of Professor Hackett are worthy of note, namely, "Nor does the Epistle itself offer anything to conflict with this decision (of the external evidence). It is impossible to conceive of a composition more strongly marked within the same limits by those unstudied assonances of thought, sentiment, and expression, which indicate an author's hand, than this short Epistle as compared with Paul's other productions. Paley has a paragraph in his Horæ Paulinæ which illustrates this feature in a very just and forcible manner. It will be found also that all the historical allusions which the Apostle makes to events in his own life, or to other persons with whom he was connected, harmonize perfectly with the statements or incidental intimations contained in the Acts of the Apostles, or the other Epistles of Paul." [37]

Very vigorous attacks have been made upon this inimitable Epistle by an arrogant hypercriticism, but all of these attacks have always been met successfully. Reuss writes, "The fact that criticism has presumed to call in question the genuineness of these harmless lines only shows that itself is not the genuine thing." [38] Indeed rationalistic criticism has nowhere shown more conclusively its own unscientific and unreasonable character than in its treatment of this Epistle. And even Baur, one of its

[37] Article in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.
[38] Reuss' History of the New Testament, Vol. I., p. 118.

assailants, is compelled to acknowledge "that modern criticism, in assailing this particular book, runs a greater risk of exposing itself to the imputation of an excessive distrust, a morbid sensibility to doubt and denial, than in questioning the claims of any other Epistle ascribed to Paul."

II. The Person Addressed.

The person addressed is Philemon, a Colossian Christian. Salutations are likewise addressed to Apphia and Archippus, who in all probability were respectively the wife and son of Philemon, as well as to the church that gathered in their house for worship. Onesimus, the bearer of the letter and to whom it refers, was also a Colossian (Col. 4 : 9), and the former slave of Philemon. An effort has been made to prove that Laodicea, and not Colossæ, was the home of these people. This inference has been drawn from Col. 4 : 16, 17, which, it is claimed, shows that Archippus, and hence also his parents Philemon and Apphia, were residents of Laodicea. But the injunction, "Say to Archippus," is addressed to the Colossians and not the Laodiceans. Furthermore Onesimus is explicitly called a Colossian (Col. 4 : 9). The evidence is rather positively in favor of their all being Colossians.

Philemon was evidently a man of considerable means, who had placed at least a part of his commodious house at the disposal of the Colossian Christians (Philem. 2). His son Archippus is enjoined "to take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord that thou fulfill it" (Col. 4 : 17). This injunction implies that he stood in official relation to the Colossian church. Phile-

mon was a convert of the Apostle (Philem. 19) and manifestly was no unworthy son of his spiritual father. "It is evident that on becoming a disciple he gave no common proof of the sincerity and power of his faith. His character as shadowed forth in the Epistle to him, is one of the noblest which the sacred record makes known to us. He was full of faith and good works, was docile, confiding, grateful, was forgiving, sympathizing, charitable, and a man who on a question of simple justice needed only a hint of his duty, to go even beyond it (Philem. 21). Any one who studies the Epistle will perceive that it ascribes to him these varied qualities, it bestows on him a measure of commendation which forms a striking contrast to the ordinary reserve of the sacred writers. It was through such believers that the primitive Christianity evinced its divine origin and spread so rapidly among the nations."

III. The Occasion and Design of the Epistle.

Onesimus, the bearer of this letter, was the runaway slave of Philemon. It is probable that he had either robbed his master, or caused him some financial loss (vrs. 18) which the Apostle offers to make good. Fugitive slaves found a peculiar attraction in Rome, as it afforded them a place where they could not be easily detected and apprehended. "But at Rome," writes Bishop Lightfoot, "the Apostle spread his net for him, and he was caught in its meshes. How he came in contact with the imprisoned missionary we can only conjecture. Was it an acci-

dental encounter with his fellow-townsman Epaphras in the streets of Rome, which led to the interview? Was it the pressure of want which induced him to seek alms from one whose large-hearted charity must have been a household word in his master's family? Or did the memory of solemn words, which he chanced to overhear at those weekly gatherings in the upper chamber at Colossæ, haunt him in his loneliness, till, yielding to the fascination, he was constrained to unburden himself to the one man who could soothe his terrors and satisfy his yearnings? Whatever motive may have drawn him to the Apostle's side, — whether the pangs of hunger or the gnawings of conscience, — when he was once in the range of attraction, he could not escape. He listened, was impressed, was convinced, was baptized. The slave of Philemon became the freeman of Christ."[39]

But though now a freeman of Christ, Onesimus was still legally the slave of Philemon. Paul indeed felt that Philemon owed him enough to justify his retaining Onesimus with him, but he did not so retain him. In regard to him he writes to Philemon, "Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the Gospel" (vr. 13). But Paul was unwilling to keep him without his owner's free consent, so he adds, "But without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be, as it were, of necessity, but willingly." The *occasion*, then, of the Epistle was the sending of Onesimus back to his master.

The object of the letter was to secure the slave's freedom. He consequently urges Philemon to re-

[39] Lightfoot on Col. and Philem., p. 312.

ceive him, "not as a servant [Greek, bond-servant], but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord. If thou count me, therefore, a partner, receive him as myself" (vrs. 16, 17). And furthermore the Apostle enjoins Philemon, "If he hath wronged thee or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account; I, Paul, have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it" (vrs. 18, 19). And to this, Paul adds a very touching, delicate reference to the debt that Philemon himself owes the Apostle, saying, "Albeit, I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me, even thine own self besides." It does not seem, judging from the character of Philemon delineated in this Epistle, that this touching and earnest appeal could have failed of its purpose. Paul sent Onesimus back to Philemon, not to condemn him again to the bondage of human slavery, but with such a letter in his hand as would certainly secure his freedom. It is noticeable that the Apostle does not ask out and out for the manumission of Onesimus, but he writes in such a way that Philemon could not help granting this, even if he was otherwise minded. "Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord: refresh my bowels in the Lord. Having confidence in thy obedience, I write unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also do more than I say." Certainly he could do nothing less than the Apostle plainly by inference asked him to do.

Tradition busies itself with the after history of these two men, making them bishops over different churches, but we can place no confidence in these traditions. The Lord has not seen fit to allow us to follow their history any further.

IV. Contents of the Epistle.

1. Salutation. 1–3.

2. Thanksgiving for Philemon's character, as manifested in his attitude toward Christ and all believers. 4–7.

3. Main portion of the Epistle, in which Philemon is entreated to forget and forgive the past, and to receive Onesimus not as a slave, but as a friend and Christian brother. 8–21.

4. Closing salutations and benediction. 23–25.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

This matter having been fully discussed under Colossians, it need not be repeated. It was written at Rome at the close of 62 A. D., or early in 63 A. D. Onesimus carried it to its destination. It was written by the Apostle without the usual assistance of an amanuensis.

VI. Peculiarities.

The whole Epistle was written by the Apostle, he dispensing with the services of an amanuensis in this case. The personal character and object of the Epistle excluded any doctrinal statements. It is a private letter, pertaining to matters that affected two persons in particular. Much has been written about the literary character and tone of this letter. The feelings that prompted its composition, and that are so manifest in every line of it, are peculiarly attractive. "Dignity, generosity, prudence, friendship, affection, politeness, skillful address, and purity are apparent. Hence it has been called with great propriety, *the polite Epistle.* True delicacy, fine

address, consummate courtesy, nice strokes of rhetoric, make it a unique specimen of the epistolary style. It shows the perfect Christian gentleman."[40]

This Epistle shows also the way in which Christianity grapples with the evils of human society. To have directly antagonized the institution of human slavery, inwrought as it was in the warp and woof of the Roman Empire, would have precipitated a conflict between Rome and Christianity, and Rome would have turned all her power against the Christian religion. But, as Bishop Wordsworth writes, "The Gospel of Christ by christianizing the master, enfranchised the slave. It did not legislate about names and forms, but it went to the root of the evil. It spoke to the heart of man. When the heart of the master was stirred with divine grace, and was warmed with the love of Christ, the rest would soon follow. The lips would speak kind things, the hand would do liberal things. Every Onesimus would be treated by every Philemon as a beloved brother in Christ Jesus. That short letter from 'the hired house' of the aged Apostle, 'Christ's bondman' at Rome, may be called a divine act of emancipation: one far more powerful than any edict of manumission by sovereigns and Senates,—one from whose sacred principles all human statutes for the abolition of slavery derive their virtue."

In these days when so much hope is placed on legislative enactment against the social and moral evils of human society, it would be well to remember the lessons of this charming little Epistle. Ere the streams are purified, the sources must be cleansed.

[40] Quoted from Davidson in Gloag's Introd., p. 304.

So the heart must be changed ere we can hope for any real freedom for our fellow-men from the various shackles which sin has welded around them.

IX. THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

I. Canonicity.

Few of the books of the New Testament have a stronger external attestation than this one has. Clement of Rome (96), and Barnabas (106) present such coincidences to the language of this Epistle, as to show their use of it. Of Ignatius (115) it may be said that certain words in the shorter Greek recension of his letter to the Ephesians are a clear assertion of the Pauline authorship of this Epistle. And there is little reason for denying that Polycarp (116) had it. We are informed by Hippolytus that Valentinus (130) quoted it. According to Tertullian it was contained in Marcion's Catalogue (130). We can see it named in the Muratori Canon (170). The Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions contained it. Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195), quote it by name and as of Pauline origin. And then in connection with these witnesses, attention should be paid to the marked literary dependence of First Peter upon this Epistle. Could any stronger external testimony be asked for than this?

The internal evidence is none the less positive in its support of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle. The most striking peculiarities of the Apostle's matter and manner abound in it. Here we have numerous examples of the usual strong Pauline ex-

pressions; as well as long and involved periods, which are formed by an accumulation of clauses joined together by series of participles. "He speaks of the exceeding greatness (1 : 19) of the divine power; of the exceeding riches (2 : 7) of the divine grace; of himself as less than the least of all the saints (3 : 8); of knowing the love of Christ which passeth knowledge (3 : 19), and of Christ ascending far above all heavens (4 : 10). So also, as Paley remarks, there is a frequent use of the word *riches* in a metaphorical sense, a favorite expression of the Apostle, which is often employed in his other Epistles, but nowhere so frequently as in this Epistle."[41] (1 : 7, 18; 2 : 7; 3 : 8, 16). But of all the peculiarities in either style or matter, there are none that are not paralleled in the other Pauline Epistles.

Against all this testimony it has been urged by some that this Epistle is only a weak and verbose expansion of the Epistle to the Colossians. The objectors claim that it is at best a weak imitation of genuine Pauline writings. Referring to these objections Bishop Ellicott says that they are "purely of a subjective character, being mainly founded on imaginary weaknesses in style, or equally imaginary references to early Gnosticism, and have been so fairly and fully confuted that they can no longer be considered to deserve any serious consideration."[42] The peculiar absence of personal salutations to individuals, usually found in the Apostle's letter, has been seized upon as another mark of its un-Pauline origin. But the purpose and the destination of the

[41] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 309.

[42] Com. on Eph. Introd., p. 12.

letter will fully account for this feature. It was sent not only to the Ephesian church, but also to other churches, as it is really an encyclical letter. This fact precludes personal salutations. The similarity of this letter to Colossians was occasioned by the fact that they were written at the same time and forwarded by the same letter carrier to their respective destinations, and also because they were sent to the same general locality, having very much the same needs.

Summing up the case, we may say that all the direct evidence in the case supports its Pauline authorship. In the mind of the Church there has never been a doubt about this. Doubts have only existed in the minds of those who are swayed by subjective considerations, and who have allowed the objective proof to sink out of sight.

II. The Ephesian Church.

Ephesus was the capital of the Roman proconsular province of Asia. It was situated on the river Cayster, not very far from the coast of the Ægean Sea. It was a large and populous city, commanding a large share of the commercial interests of Asia Minor. Its situation was most favorable for businesses of all kinds, for at its docks might be found the vessels of every maritime nation, while from it great highways led out in many directions for inland commerce. One of the so-called seven wonders of the world was to be seen in Ephesus in the great temple dedicated to Diana. Thousands of people were annually attracted to the city by the religious

ceremonies in that great structure, whose one hundred and twenty-seven magnificent pillars were said to have been the gifts of a like number of kings. The celebrity of this city was doubtless to be attributed to the worship of its patron goddess Diana.

It was upon his second missionary journey, as he was on his way back to Jerusalem, that Paul came to Ephesus, in the early Spring of 54 A. D. Paul in company with Aquila and Priscilla set sail from Corinth and came to Ephesus. His preaching in the synagogue seems to have met with immediate success, and he was requested to remain there. His plan, however, was to hasten on to Jerusalem to observe the approaching feast (Acts 18:21), which was probably Pentecost, and occurred that year on May 31. In accordance with this plan, leaving Aquila and Priscilla in Ephesus, and promising to return there as soon as he could, if such was God's will, Paul went on to Jerusalem, where he tarried only a short time, and then proceeded to Antioch. It was probably during the latter part of the Summer of 54 A. D. that the untiring missionary set out on his third missionary journey. After passing through Phrygia and Galatia, "strengthening all the disciples," he came late in the same year to Ephesus, where he remained until after Pentecost of 57 A. D.

Meanwhile, since the Apostle's short visit to Ephesus, a man who was to play an important part in the work of the Church had come to and gone from that city. This man was an Alexandrian Jew, named Apollos, who had in some way become a disciple of John the Baptist. He was an earnest and

devout person, whose desire evidently was to lead others to the faith in which he believed. He knew, however, only the baptism of John, and consequently he could not speak of the person and work of Him whose coming John the Baptist had foretold. Well was it for the interests of the work that Aquila and Priscilla were in Ephesus, for they lost no time in giving Apollos the instruction he needed. In this way he became instructed in Christian doctrine. Nor was his zeal any the less abated by this new acquisition of knowledge; for when he heard of the work in Corinth, he desired to go there and labor for the Master. On the arrival of Paul in Ephesus, he found twelve other men, who, like Apollos, were disciples of John the Baptist. John's baptism was unto repentance, but when they heard of Christ through Paul, "they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus," at the same time receiving the baptism of the Spirit which was accompanied with the same phenomena that marked the great Pentecostal outpouring.

This second visit of Paul at Ephesus was characterized by his usual intense activity. He supported himself by laboring at his trade (Acts 20: 34). At the same time, with his characteristic zeal, he preached in the synagogue for three months, "disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God." The success that crowned his labors led his Jewish opponents to calumniate his doctrine, and he was compelled to leave the synagogue. The school-room of one Tyrannus, who became a convert, afforded him a place for continuing his preaching. Nor were his efforts for Christ

confined to preaching on the Sabbath, for as he told the Ephesian elders, he taught them not only publicly, but also from house to house, warning them with tears day and night (Acts 20 : 20). "The subject of his teaching was ever the same, both for Jews and Greeks, 'repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ.' Labors so incessant, so disinterested, and continued through so long a time, could not fail to produce a great result at Ephesus. A large church was formed. Nor were the results confined to that city alone. Throughout the province of 'Asia' the name of Christ became generally known, both to Jews and Gentiles; and, doubtless, many daughter-churches were founded, whether in the course of journeys undertaken by the Apostle himself, or by means of those with whom he became acquainted, — as for instance, by Epaphras, Archippus, and Philemon, in connection with Colossæ, and its neighboring cities, Hierapolis and Laodicea."[43] During this period he also seems to have taken a hurried trip to Corinth.[44]

The patron goddess of Ephesus was Diana, whose magnificent temple attracted people from all directions. There were a great many workmen in the city, whose business was that of making for sale to visitors, images of the statue of the goddess, which was said to have fallen down from heaven. The rapid spread of Christianity and its inroads into the superstitious practices of the people, imperiled their craft. The special powers exercised by Paul seem

[43] Conybeare & Howson's Life of Paul, Vol. II., p. 20.
[44] See under 2 Corinthians.

to have been aimed at some of the prevailing superstitions; while the results of the rash experiment of the sons of Sceva (Acts 19:13–16) exalted the Apostle's work. All of these events culminated in the great riot of the idol-makers against the Christians, which probably took place in the sacred month of May, when great crowds of people flocked to the temple of Diana. The riot accomplished nothing, and as soon as it subsided, Paul called the Christians to him, and with many injunctions to them he departed from the city just after Pentecost, 57 A. D. (1 Cor. 16:8.)

In regard to the composition of the Ephesian church, it is evident that while there were some Jews in it, yet the large majority of its members were Gentiles. The various descriptive phrases of the Epistle prove conclusively that the church there might on the whole be called a Gentile church (2:11; 3:1; etc.).

III. The Destination of this Epistle.

It is a fact to be noted in regard to this Epistle that the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS of the New Testament omit the words "at Ephesus" in 1:1, the space to be occupied by those words being left vacant. This has led many to the conclusion that this Epistle was not simply written for the Ephesians alone. Paul wrote to the Colossians, "And when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea" (Col. 4:16). Some scholars claim that this Epistle to the Laodice-

ans is now lost; while others claim that it was none other than the one with which we are now dealing. The theory is that Tychicus bore several copies of this same Epistle, in one of which was written at 1 : 1 "at Ephesus," in another "at Laodicea," and very likely in other copies other names were inserted. How natural that the Apostle should enjoin the Colossians to secure the copy sent to the church nearest to them, that is, to Laodicea. In support of this theory is the encyclical character of this Epistle, which is general in its nature, and includes no personal salutations to individuals. The Epistle consequently was not intended for the Ephesians alone, but in general for that group of churches of which Ephesus was the undoubted head. This theory, first proposed by Archbishop Usher and adopted by many of the leading scholars of later days, meets the facts in the case and fully harmonizes them. It is perfectly correct to regard the Epistle as addressed to the Ephesians, but not more so to them than to a number of other and contiguous churches, of which number Laodicea was one. That it is generally called the Epistle to the Ephesians is quite appropriate, for the Ephesian church was the most prominent of those for which it was intended; and as time advanced, it became generally known as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

The *occasion* of the writing of this letter was doubtless the prospective trip of Tychicus to the Colossian church, bearing the letter addressed to them. Paul had heard, possibly through Epaphras,

of the faith and love of the Christians of the churches in and around Ephesus (Eph. 1 : 15). These two things combined led him to embrace the favorable opportunity of sending copies of this letter to their various destinations. The *purpose* of the Apostle in writing was not so much to combat error, as it was to establish the truth. He desired to strengthen the faith and encourage the hopes of the Christians of the region contiguous to Ephesus.

V. Contents of the Epistle.

I. Salutation. 1 : 1, 2.

II. Doctrinal Portion. 1 : 3–3 : 21.

1. Thanksgiving for the blessings of the redemption in Christ. 1 : 3–14.
2. Prayer that they might increase in the knowledge and experience of those blessings. 1 : 15–19.
3. Dignity of him who wrought out Salvation. 1 : 20–23.
4. Contrasts their previous state with that after their conversion by the grace of God. 2 : 1–10.
5. Contrast continued, setting forth the difference between their former condition as aliens, and their present condition as members of the household and family of God. 2 : 11–22.
6. The nature and design of Paul's commission 3 : 1–13.
7. Prays for those to whom he writes. 3 : 14–21.

III. Practical Portion. 4 : 1–6 : 20.

1. Exhortation to unity. 4 : 1–16.
2. Exhortation to holiness. 4 : 17–24.
3. Special injunctions. 4 : 25–31.
   (1). Against lying, 25, (2), anger, 26, 27, (3), robbery, 28, (4), impure words. 29–31.
4. Exhortation to Christian love and forgiveness. 4 : 32–5 : 2.
5. Specific exhortations. 5 : 3–20.
   (1). Against impurity, 3–10, (2), to show forth Christian character, 11–20.
6. Definitions of duties of, 5 : 21–6 : 9.
   (1). Husbands and wives, 21–33, (2), children and parents, 6 : 1–4, (3), servants and masters, 6 : 5–9.
7. The Christian's armor described. 6 : 10–17.
8. The need of prayer and its uses. 6 : 18–20.

IV. Conclusion. 6 : 21–24.

1. The duty of Tychicus, the letter bearer. 6 : 21, 22.
2. Benediction. 6 : 23, 24.

VI. The Date and Place of Composition.

This Epistle was written at Rome, and sent to its destination by the hand of Tychicus at the same time that he carried the Epistle to the Colossians, that is, late in 62 A. D., or possibly early in 63 A. D. Tychicus was also to tell to those to whom it was written, the facts in regard to the Apostle, as well as by his own words to comfort and encourage them.

VII. The Peculiarities of the Epistle.

The first thing noticeable in the study of this Epistle is its encyclical character, a feature that

renders it devoid of the customary personal salutations of the Apostle.

Another peculiarity is its great similarity in thought and language to the Epistle to the Colossians. We have already noted the fact that this characteristic has been used by some critics in a way hostile to the Epistle. But this letter is by no means a mere expansion of Colossians. "These two Epistles are similar, and yet distinct; similar in their language and practical exhortations; dissimilar in their design and mode of doctrinal treatment. The Epistle to the Colossians is polemical, and aims at the refutation of heresy; the Epistle to the Ephesians is dogmatic, and serves to the establishment of truth. The one is special, and deals with the errors of Jewish Gnostics; the other is general, and is designed for the edification of believers. The one is a Christian apology; the other is a doctrinal treatise on election and grace."[45] Godet writes, "The central idea of the Epistle to the Colossians is this: Christ the Head, from whom the body derives its nourishment; while the central idea of what we call the Epistle to the Ephesians is the Church, the body which Christ fills with His divine fullness, and raised to sit with Him in the heavenly places. Of these two thoughts, which supplement each other, the second was suggested by the first. The first note struck woke the vibrations of the next; then followed a pæan of Divine harmonies. What could be more natural than that two strains thus suggested, should have many tones in common, though each set in a different key?"[46]

[45] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 334.

[46] Expositor, 3rd Series, Vol. V., p. 389.

To illustrate the similarity between these two Epistles the following passages, cited from De Wette by Gloag, may be compared, namely:—

Doctrinal Portions.		Practical Portions.	
Eph 1:7	Col 1:14	Eph. 4:1	Col. 1:10
" 1:10	" 1:20	" 4:2-4	" 3:12-14
" 1:15-17	" 1:3, 4	" 4:15, 16	" 2:19
" 1:18	" 1:27	" 4:22-24	" 3:8, 9
" 1:21	" 1:16	" 4:31	" 3:8
" 1:22, 23	" 1:18, 19	" 4:32	" 3:12
" 2:5	" 2:13	" 5:6	" 3:6
" 2:11	" 2:11	" 5:15, 16	" 4:5
" 2:16	" 1:20	" 5:19, 20	" 3:16, 17
" 3:2, 3	" 1:25, 26	" 5:22	" 3:18
" 3:7	" 1:23	" 6:1	" 3:20
		" 6:5-8	" 3:22-25
		" 6:9	" 4:1
		" 6:18-20	" 4:3, 4
		" 6:21, 22	" 4:7, 8

This Epistle, because of its grammatical structure, is one of the most difficult of all the Pauline Epistles in the explanation of some of its parts. "Each single word is perfectly intelligible; but the sentences are so long, and the members of which each sentence consists are at the same time so short, that they are frequently capable of many different constructions, of which we cannot easily determine which is the right one." [47]

The specially noteworthy passages are the contrasts between the unregenerate and the regenerate (2:1–22), the prayer of the Apostle (3:13–21), and the description of the Christian's armor (6:11–17). The words of Dr. Schaff may well conclude the study of this Epistle. "Ephesians is, in some respects, the most profound and difficult (though not

[47] Michaelis' Introd., Marsh's translation, Vol. VI., p. 151.

the most important) of Paul's Epistles. It certainly is the most spiritual and devout, composed in an exalted and transcendent state of mind, where theology runs into worship, and meditation into oration. It is the Epistle of the Heavenlies, an ode to Christ and His spotless bride, the Song of Songs in the New Testament. The aged Apostle soared high above all earthly things to the invisible and eternal realities in heaven. From his gloomy confinement he transcended for a season to the mount of transfiguration. The prisoner of Christ, chained to a heathen soldier, was transformed into a conqueror, clad in the panoply of God, and singing a pæan of victory."[48]

X. THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

I. Canonicity.

The *external* testimony in favor of this Epistle is remarkably full and strong. Clement of Rome (96) shows his dependence on it, and the same is true of Ignatius (115). Polycarp (116) wrote a letter to the Philippians in which he refers definitely to the fact of Paul's having written to them, and in several places he uses the very language of this Epistle. In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120) several expressions are borrowed from this Epistle. The Epistle to Diognetus (117), Justin Martyr (145), Melito (170), Theophilus (175), adopt its language and supply references to it. The Epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne (177) quotes Phil. 2 : 6. Marcion's catalogue (130), the Muratori Canon

[48] Schaff's History of the Christian Church, Vol. I., p. 779.

(170), and the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions, include it. And when we come to Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195), we find it formally quoted by name and ascribed to the Apostle.

The *internal* evidence is likewise strong. The Epistle abounds in words and expressions and constructions that are peculiar to Paul alone. The character of the Apostle is also plainly stamped upon it. "No Epistle of the Apostle," says Schenkel, "according to our observations, bears the impress of authenticity in such unmistakable characters as the Epistle to the Philippians." Dean Gwynn writes, "But greater far than these tokens of genuineness, is that which underlies: the solid and irrefragable evidence contained in the ideas, the feelings, the aspirations, of which our Epistle is the vehicle, and which no one who has in any degree entered into the mind of St. Paul, can doubt to be his. For a forger successfully to assume his language, and to imagine his circumstances, would be a difficult effort of historic and literary skill. But that such a one could so personate that unique individuality — think his thoughts, speak out of his heart — is inconceivable."[49] With his usual skill Dr. Gloag sums up the evidences of the character of Paul as impressed on this Epistle. "The intense devotion to Christ (1 : 20), the ardent affection for his converts (1 : 7, 8 ; 4 : 1), the earnestness in prayer for their spiritual welfare (1 : 4), the womanly tenderness (4 : 10), the delicate courtesy displayed in the reception of the gifts of the Philippians (4 : 14–19),

[49] Bible Com., Introd. to Philippians.

the noble elevation above all earthy cares (4 : 12), the personal humility combined with the assertion of apostolic authority (3 : 4–11), and the liberality of mind (1 : 18), are all distinguishing features in the character of the great Apostle."[50]

In view of this evidence we may with Dean Alford characterize the few and weak assaults upon this Epistle as "an instance of the insanity of hypercriticism." To the mind swayed more by objective testimony than by subjective considerations, there cannot come any doubt that this is a genuine Epistle of Paul. And if this is established, its canonicity is likewise demonstrated.

II. The Philippian Church.

The city of Philippi was founded by Philip of Macedon, who gave to it his own name. To this city was given by Cæsar Augustus the privileges of a Roman colony. It was one of the most important cities of Macedonia. Its situation was about nine miles inland from the Ægean Sea at its extreme north-western corner. Neapolis was its sea-port. The great Egnatian highway built by Rome across Macedonia and up into Thrace passed through Philippi. The surrounding plains were rich and fertile. With these natural advantages it was a large and thriving city, and was situated at "the confluence of streams of European and Asiatic life." It was a Roman colony on Greek soil, with Grecian language, usages, and religion. "Combining thus the two main constituents of European life,

[50] Introd., to the Pauline Epistles p. 337.

giving entrance to every element that Europe drew to itself from the wider life without, it was in all points a typical city of Europe; it offered itself as a fit station for the planting of the standard — first raised in the East, but destined to have in the West its greatest and abiding triumphs — of Him whose kingdom was to rise in the ruins of the kingdoms of this world, itself to stand forever." [51]

To this city Paul came on his second missionary journey. It was at Alexandria Troas that the Apostle heard the Macedonian call (Acts 16:9). In obedience to it he immediately crossed the Ægean Sea with his companions, Silas, Timothy, and Luke, and landing at Neapolis, they passed on together to Philippi. There were not a great many Jews in this city, for there does not seem to have been a synagogue. The following Sabbath the missionary band found a few devout women gathered for prayer at a Proseucha [52] outside of the city on the banks of the Gangites. The first convert made was Lydia, an Asiatic of Thyatira, a dealer in dyed goods, who had previously become a proselyte to the Jewish faith. Her opened heart responded to the words of Paul, and immediately she embraced the faith in Christ. Being apparently a woman of at least comfortable circumstances, she persuaded the missionaries to become her guests. The next convert mentioned was the crazy young Macedonian girl whom Paul healed. Her owners, who had made her crazy muttering a source of income, enraged at the change wrought in her,

[51] Bible Commentary, Introd. to Philippians.

[52] A place of prayer.

seized Paul and Silas and brought them before the magistrates, accusing them of being troublers of the peace. Without even the formality of investigating these charges, the magistrates commanded that they should be scourged and put in prison. And the jailor, a brutal man, added to the injustice of the whole affair by making their feet fast in the stocks in the inner prison. That night a sudden earthquake shook the prison to its foundation and hurled the doors wide open. This earthquake and the attendant circumstances brought conviction to the heart of the jailor, and ere the light of another day had shone on the city, he also had become a follower of the Saviour. The Roman citizenship of the Apostle had been grossly violated by the treatment he had experienced, and when the magistrates learned their error, they gladly tried to make amends for their conduct. It was contrary to the law to scourge a Roman citizen who had not been condemned by due process. Had Paul seen fit to lodge information against the Philippian magistrates, he could have had them severely punished. Immediately after his release, the Apostle, leaving Luke at Philippi, continued his journey. Some five years later he spent a few days in this city again on his third missionary journey. That was some time after Pentecost in 57 A. D. The following Passover (Mar. 27, 58 A. D.) was also spent at Philippi (Acts 20:6).

From this sketch it is evident that Paul was not permitted to spend very much time with his beloved Philippians. There were, however, many oral communications between them. Paul had scarcely left

them after his first visit, ere they had sent an offering for his aid. "Even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity" (Phil. 4 : 16). It was most probably to them that the Apostle referred in 2 Cor. 8 : 3, 4, "For to their power I bear record, yea, and beyond their power they were willing of themselves ; praying us with much entreaty that we would receive their gift." Nor was it out of their abundance that they gave to the Apostle for his own needs, as well as for the poor saints at Jerusalem, but out of "their deep poverty." For some time previous to the writing of this Epistle, the Philippians had lacked opportunity of ministering to the Apostle's necessities. At length, however, they had heard of his needs in Rome, and immediately they took steps to relieve him. They sent their offering by the hand of Epaphroditus, one of their number, who was also to do all in his power for the beloved Apostle. It was a timely and precious testimonial of their love for Paul. It relieved his pressing needs and distress, and he writes, "I have all and abound. I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you."

As he wrote, Paul hoped to see them very soon, and doubtless, when he was released, he went as quickly as possible to those people who had given him such substantial evidence of their love and sympathy. About fifty years after this Ignatius passed through this city on his way to Rome to die a martyr's death, and he was warmly welcomed by the Philippian Christians. It was in 116 A. D. that Polycarp wrote his well known letter to these same people. "But not long did the promising church remain. Of its destruction and decay, no record

is left; and among its ruins, travelers have hitherto failed to find any Christian remains. Of the church which stood foremost among all the apostolic communities in faith and love, it may literally be said, that not one stone stands upon another. Its whole career is a signal monument of the inscrutable counsels of God. Born into the world with highest promise, the church of Philippi has lived without a history, and perished without a memorial."[53]

The Philippian church was unquestionably Gentile in its composition. Three of its members are mentioned, namely, Lydia, the crazy girl who was healed, and the jailor. They were respectively Asiatic, Macedonian, and Roman. It was a cosmopolitan church indeed, embracing several different nationalities. Woman was prominent in this church. Two of these women, Euodia and Syntyche are mentioned. It was to women that the Gospel was first preached in Philippi, and it seems from the references to them that the two named, whose aid Paul gratefully acknowledges, had differences or jealousies that might work mischief in the church unless ended. With this exception the Apostle knows of nothing for which to condemn them. On the contrary their loving regard for, and attention to, Paul elicits from him the warmest and most affectionate expressions.

III. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

Epaphroditus, the messenger of the Philippians, now convalescing from the serious illness he had had as the result of his zealous service of Paul, was

[53] Lightfoot on Philippians, p. 65.

about to return to his home at Philippi. This opportunity of addressing a letter of thanks to the Philippians for their liberal offering to his necessities was the *occasion* of the Apostle's writing. Of Epaphroditus, their messenger, he writes, "For the work of Christ, he was nigh unto death, not regarding his life, to supply your lack of service toward me." The special object of the Epistle was to express his genuine thankfulness to the Philippians for their gift. It is peculiarly a letter of gratitude, and in connection with this he uses the opportunity to attempt to reconcile some differences that had arisen among some of them, as well as to warn them against error.

There seems to have been a change in the Apostle's position since he wrote his last letter. It may be that the death of Burrhus, the humane Prætorian Prefect, had occurred, and that the accession of the infamous Tigellinus had caused this change. Paul writes that "all seek their own, and not the things of Jesus Christ's." The apparent lack of attention from the Roman Christians made the gift of the Philippians all the more acceptable, and in this loving letter the great Apostle shows his deep appreciation of their kindness. In this letter the Apostle informs the Philippians that he proposes to send Timothy to them just as soon as he knows how his case before Nero turns out (2 : 23). His purpose in sending Timothy is "that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state," and also to inform them of the outcome of his trial. He can think of no other person so well fitted to discharge this commission, indeed, he has no

other person with him to whom he can entrust the business.

IV. Contents of the Epistle.

There is no apparent plan in the structure of this Epistle. The circumstances under which he wrote, as well as the feelings prompting the letter, would not permit of any formal and logical arrangement.

1. Salutation. 1 : 1, 2.
2. Thanksgiving, and prayer for the Philippian Christians. 1 : 3–11.
3. Account of the progress of the Gospel in Rome, as well as his position, feelings, and hopes. 1 : 12–26.
4. Exhortations. 1 : 27–2 : 16.
   (1.) To be consistent, of one mind and of heroic faith. 1 : 27–2 : 4.
   (2.) To consider Christ, the great example of humility. 2 : 5–11.
   (3.) To follow His example practically. 2 : 12–16.
5. Personal matters. 2 : 17–30.
   (1.) Personal appeal. 2 : 17, 18.
   (2.) The proposed visit of Timothy to them. 2 : 19–23.
   (3.) Expression of hope of seeing them soon. 2 : 24.
   (4.) Mission and illness of Epaphroditus. 2 : 25–30.
6. Final exhortations begun, 3 : 1, but suddenly broken off by a digression to warn them,
   (1.) Against Judaistic error, illustrated by his own example. 3 : 2–16.

(2.) Against Antinomian error, pointing again to his own example, and, warning against turning from the right path, he appeals to them to live according to their heavenly citizenship. 3 : 17–21.

7. Resumption of exhortations. 4 : 1–9.
   (1.) Urges them to stand fast in the Lord. 4 : 1.
   (2.) Appeals to Euodia and Syntyche to be of one mind. 4 : 2, 3.
   (3.) Exhorts them to be joyful, free from harassing care, and to follow that which is pure and true, etc. 4 : 4–9.
8. Acknowledges gratefully their gift and invokes a blessing on them. 4 : 10–20.
9. Closing salutations and benediction. 4 : 21–23.

V. The Date and Place of Composition.

The order in which these Epistles of the captivity have been treated shows that this one is regarded as the last one of them. It has already been noted[54] that some claim that the other three Epistles of this group were written at Cæsarea, but with only a very few exceptions scholars unite in holding that this Epistle was written at Rome. Of this there is no reason for any question. A close examination of the Epistle makes it manifest that some change had come over the affairs of the Apostle since he wrote the other three letters. Here he more plainly expresses the hope that he would soon be released, although all is as yet darkly uncertain in regard to his future

[54] See under Colossians.

(2:23). The accession of Tigellinus in 62 A. D. to the Prætorian Prefectship doubtless made the Apostle's confinement more severe. By him he would not be treated with as much consideration as had been accorded him by the humane Burrhus. Luke and Aristarchus, who were with him when he wrote Colossians, were now absent,—possibly on some errand, or, perhaps, driven away by the change in Paul's affairs. The confinement was closer, and, although hopeful, Paul was doubtful about the issue of the near future. Was it not the darkest hour just before the dawn of his release?

Another fact that necessitates placing this letter late in the two years of his confinement at Rome is developed when the mission of Epaphroditus is considered. Sufficient time must have elapsed after Paul's arrival in Rome for him to reach a point of need; for the Philippians to have heard of that need and to have made preparation for his relief; for Epaphroditus, their messenger, to go to Rome in the behalf of Paul; for another messenger to return to Philippi with the news of his serious illness; for another messenger to go to Rome with their message of condolence and sympathy for Epaphroditus. It would ordinarily take at least a month for the journey between the two cities. For this reason this letter must be dated toward the end of the captivity.

In view of these things, while we cannot affirm it absolutely, yet we date this Epistle in the Spring of 63 A. D., several months later than the composition of the other three letters of this group. It

was carried to its destination by the convalescent Epaphroditus, as he returned to his home in Philippi.

VI. Peculiarities.

This Epistle is peculiar in that it is pre-eminently a letter of commendation, and has in it no notes of condemnation. In this respect it is in marked contrast with the Epistle to the Galatians. Here we can read more clearly than any other place the inner character of the great Apostle to the Gentiles. "He gives full vent to the expressions of his affection for his Philippian converts; he mentions his earnest prayer for their spiritual advancement, his tender solicitations, his joy at the steadfastness of their faith and the purity of their conduct. The whole Epistle is a mixture of love and joy,— love for his converts, and joy at their spiritual welfare."[55]

Another feature is the absence of doctrinal discussions. It contains, it is true, the classical passage on the humiliation and the exaltation of Christ, which is likewise the nearest approach Paul makes in any of his Epistles to a dogmatic affirmation of the divinity of our Lord (2 : 5–11). But this passage was written to emphasize and illustrate an exhortation, rather than for polemical reasons. The whole Epistle is concerned rather with practice than with dogma. It is pre-eminently the Epistle of joy and love.

3. The Pastoral Epistles.

We have now come in our studies to the third and last group of the Pauline Epistles, commonly known as the Pastoral Epistles. This title has been

[55] Gloag's Introd., to the Pauline Epistles, p. 353.

applied to them "because they are official letters addressed to Paul's fellow-laborers, and contain instructions concerning the government of the Church and its office bearers." Merely a cursory examination of them will suffice to show that they are different in many respects from the other Pauline Epistles, and form a distinct group by themselves.

Before formally entering in upon the study of these Epistles in their chronological order, it is necessary to pause to consider the movements of the Apostle after he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians in the Spring of 63 A. D. The question now arises: Was Paul released from his Roman imprisonment in accordance with the hope expressed in Philippians? Was his trial before Nero ended by his condemnation and death, as some assert; or by his acquittal and liberation, as others confidently affirm? Upon this question a vast mass of matter has been written, and it will be impossible to follow up all the various theories that have been propounded for the purpose of explaining the facts. But if we would be guided by the unanimous and unhesitating belief of the early Church, we must hold to his release and a subsequent time of activity, followed by a second imprisonment that resulted in his condemnation and death. "It was universally believed that St. Paul's appeal to Cæsar terminated successfully; that he was acquitted of the charge laid against him; and that he spent some years in freedom before he was again imprisoned and condemned. *The evidence on this subject, though not copious, is yet conclusive so far as it goes, and is all one way.*"[56] This evidence is pre-

[56] Conybeare and Howson's St. Paul, Vol. II., p. 437.

sented by the Epistles themselves, by Clement of Rome, the Muratori Canon, Eusebius the historian, Chrysostom, and Jerome. They all are positive in their affirmations, or at least, in their intimations, that Paul was released.

It is generally acknowledged that we cannot find any place in the history of the Apostle, as we know it from the Acts, into which these Epistles will fit. The historical allusions they contain do not, and cannot be made to, harmonize with the Acts. It is a matter of fact that those who deny that Paul was released from the Roman imprisonment of Acts 28, as a rule reject these Epistles, inasmuch as they can find no place for them in the life of the Apostle up to that time. On the other hand, the large majority of those who do defend and accept these Epistles as Pauline, affirm that Paul was released. It has been said that "the supposition of a second Roman imprisonment is the only way in which the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles can be proved. This concession alone can solve the serious difficulties." Many are the schemes that have been proposed by which the attempt has been made to find a place before and during the time of the first imprisonment for the composition of these Epistles.[57] And those who doubt the liberation of Paul are compelled to resort to all sorts of expedients to enable them to explain the allusions of

[57] The scope of this work will not permit an elaborate examination of this question. The reader is referred to Conybeare and Howson's Life and Letters of St, Paul, p. 354 ff.; The Bible Commentary, Introd. to the Pastoral Epistles; Gloag's Introd., p. 354; Huther's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles; Weiss' Introd., Vol. I., p. 374.

these Epistles. They all, however, in the judgment of the majority of scholars fail to prove their point.[58]

If, then, we are to accept the external evidence, we must acknowledge the release of Paul from his first Roman imprisonment. And when we turn to these Pastoral Epistles, every candid mind must confess that they refer to facts that necessitate the same conclusion. These facts will be particularly noted when the dates of these letters are respectively considered.

It is extremely difficult to determine exactly the movements of the Apostle after his release. For these we are dependent entirely on the incidental references of the letters in question. The following is suggested, however, as a possible outline of Paul's movements after his release. During the early Summer of 63 A. D., the long delayed final trial before Nero came up, and resulted in the acquittal of the Apostle. Leaving Rome as soon as possible thereafter, Paul followed the plan indicated in Philemon 22 and Philippians 2 : 24. This would take him directly into Macedonia, where he in all probability visited rapidly all the churches along and near the line of the Egnatian highway. At Philippi he remained for a time, but his presence being needed in Asia Minor because of the growth of heresy, he pressed on to Ephesus. Affairs there required considerable attention, and doubtless while in that

[58] In regard to Weiss, it is to be noted, that while he will not absolutely assert the genuineness of these Epistles, yet he actually proves that point, and in so doing also establishes the fact of the Apostle's release.

locality he visited the churches of Colossæ and Laodicea.

At length having straightened out matters in and about Ephesus, he took his long contemplated visit to the far West in 64 A. D. (Rom. 15 : 24). We have no means of telling how long he remained in Spain. The persistency and unanimity of the tradition that he did make this journey, can only be accounted for on the basis that he actually did make it. Returning from the West, he came once more to Ephesus in 66 A. D. Here he found that the Gnostic heretics had been intensely active during his absence, and were doing their utmost to propagate their peculiar theories. "Heretical teachers had arisen in the very bosom of the church, and were leading away the believers after themselves. Hymenæus and Philetus were sowing in congenial soil the seed which was destined in another century to bear so ripe a crop of error. The East and West were infusing their several elements of poison into the pure cup of Gospel truth. In Asia Minor, as at Alexandria, Hellenic philosophism did not refuse to blend with Oriental theosophy; the Jewish superstitions of the Kabbala, and the wild speculations of the Persian Magi, were combined with the Greek craving for an enlightened and esoteric religion."[59]

At Ephesus once more, the Apostle found himself in the midst of a mighty conflict with error. Like a mighty flood heresy was sweeping over that whole region. No corner of the earth has been more fruitful of heretical ideas than Asia Minor was. We may be sure that the great champion of a pure and un-

[59] Conybeare and Howson's St. Paul, Vol. II., p. 447.

trammeled Gospel waged a valiant fight with the heresiarchs. Presently he was called to Macedonia by some sudden necessity (1 Tim. 1 : 3). When he arrived there he found that his return to Ephesus was likely to be somewhat delayed, and having left Timothy in charge of the Ephesian church, he felt the need of communicating with him, and accordingly he wrote from Macedonia his First Epistle to his beloved son Timothy. As soon as his business in Macedonia was finished, he hastened back to Ephesus in accordance with his plan (1 Tim. 4 : 13). Presently he had another journey to make, and that was to Crete. On that island, disturbances had arisen that demanded his presence. For some reason he was not able to finish all that needed to be done, so he left Titus in charge and returned to Ephesus. Planning to spend the following Winter (that of 67 A. D.) at Nicopolis in Epirus, he wrote his Epistle to Titus on the eve of his departure. From Ephesus Paul went to Miletus, where he was compelled to leave Trophimus on account of sickness (2 Tim. 4 : 20). From thence he passed on to Corinth where Erastus remained, as it was his home. From Corinth the Apostle went on to Epirus, where it had been his intention to spend the Winter. But did he remain there that Winter? Certainly not, if the Winter of 2 Tim. 4 : 21 was the same as that of Titus 3 : 12. My belief is that Paul did not remain as he intended at Nicopolis throughout the Winter of 67–68 A. D. He probably remained for a short time, for in 2 Tim. 4 : 10 he informs us that Titus had gone unto Dalmatia. From this I infer that Titus found the Apostle at Nicopolis, and was

sent from there on up to Dalmatia soon after his arrival. Some believe that Paul was arrested at Nicopolis and from thence taken to Rome for his second imprisonment. But when did he leave his cloak at Troas with the book and the parchments (2 Tim. 4 : 13)? Some think his course from Ephesus was to Miletus, thence to Troas, thence to Corinth, and thence to Nicopolis. But why should he go from Miletus to Corinth by such a round-about way as Troas? I think it far more probable that, perceiving that his remaining at Nicopolis was fraught with danger, he remained there but a short time, and hurrying across Macedonia, he came to Troas. Something led him to venture down to Ephesus for a short visit — so short a visit did he expect to make that he left his cloak, books, and parchments at Troas — intending to return there. But his time had come, and at the instigation of Alexander the coppersmith he was arrested and so hurriedly taken to Rome that he could not get the articles he had left at Troas.[60]

Of course this scheme is largely conjectural, but after long and careful study I am led to suggest this as a possible outline of the movements of the Apostle between his two Roman imprisonments.

A great deal has been written concerning the marked peculiarities in style and matter of these compared with his other letters. These differences have been made the basis of attacks upon the

[60] Whether this Alexander was one of the leaders in the Ephesian riot (Acts 19 : 33), or the person Paul excommunicated (1 Tim. 1 : 20), we have no means of telling; but I conjecture that he was the same as the latter, and that he took this means of retaliating.

genuineness of these Epistles. But the differences can readily be accounted for on the basis of their objects and the circumstances that led to their composition. "The other Epistles afford us all needful instruction respecting the great dogmatic truths of Christianity, and the chief points of Christian morals. But respecting the practical organization and government of the Church, they furnish only incidental hints. The deficiency is supplied by these three Epistles." And just as the Gospel according to John is a fitting capstone to the Gospel history presented in the Synoptics, so these Pastoral Epistles in their place furnish a necessary climax to the Pauline Epistles as a whole.

Taking up these Epistles in their chronological order, they will now be studied.

XI. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

I. Canonicity.

Clement of Rome (96), and Barnabas (106) can be cited as doubtless having had this Epistle in their hands, although they do not formally quote it. Polycarp (116) manifestly quotes it. The Epistle to Diognetus (117), and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120), show their dependence on it. The Apology of Aristides (138-161) contains a possible quotation of 1 : 8.[61] An expression of Hegesippus (173) likewise evinces his acquaintance with its language. Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195) formally quote it by name. Marcion (130) omitted it from his catalogue,

[61] The Apology of Aristides, by J. Rendel Harris.

and Tatian (150) rejected it, but the reason for this is unquestionably because it controverts the very heresy of which they were defenders in their day. It is contained in the Muratori Canon (170), as well as in the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions. Professor Salmon, speaking of the Pastoral Epistles, says, that "if the battle had to be fought solely on the ground of external evidence, they would obtain a complete victory."

It is upon the internal evidence that this Epistle, as well as the other two, has been most violently assailed. The assaults have been made upon (1) the basis of the style, which is diverse from the other Pauline Epistles; (2) the nature of the heresies controverted, which, it is claimed, flourished much later than Paul's day; (3) the impossibility of finding a place for them in the life of Paul as detailed in the Acts. In answering these objections, we may reverse their order, and grant the force of the *third*. No place can be found in the Acts for these Epistles, for the simple reason that they were written later than the events recorded in the Acts. As to the *second* objection, it may be noted that the assailants who urge this are by no means agreed among themselves as to the peculiar form of the heretical ideas combated. That heresy had already arisen, and that Gnosticism, which early in the second century attained a rank growth, was already germinating, cannot be denied. But it can be, and is denied, that the Apostle's words indicate that that later development was already present. Wace affirms that "there are no sufficient grounds for assuming that such errors as St. Paul denounces did not exist at

Ephesus at the time supposed. The utmost that can be shown is that errors akin to these, but, as is on all hands acknowledged, by no means identical, existed a generation later. But this, so far as it goes, is rather a reason for thinking it is probable that the germs of the same errors were previously in existence, gradually changing their form and becoming more developed. At any rate when we know so little of the early growth of Gnosticism, it is arbitrary in the extreme to pronounce that the form of error described in the Pastoral Epistles could not at the time supposed have existed at Ephesus."[62] Weiss also says that "criticism itself has plainly conceded that the delineation of doctrinal errors contained in our Epistle does not harmonize with what we know of Gnosticism from history."[63] As to the *first* objection, that founded on the style of the Epistles, it should be remembered that at least four years separate them from Philippians. There is no question about the difference in diction and matter from the earlier Epistles, but this has been exaggerated by some writers. But the actual differences are readily explained "by the peculiar contents of the Epistles and by the entirely new phenomena which they oppose." It is most arbitrary to affirm that a man with the wealth and fertility of the Pauline intellect must always use the same forms of expression. Meyer exclaims, "How little are such mechanical standards of comparison at all compatible with a mind so free in movement and rich in language as was that of

[62] Bible Commentary, Introd. to Pastoral Epistles.

[63] Introd., Vol. I., p. 393.

Paul." There is a close affinity among these Pastoral Epistles to one another, and the circumstances that gave them birth readily account for their differentiating features.

The genuineness of these Epistles is also supported by the character of their author as shown in them. There is the usual characteristic of humility and self-depreciation, the same anxious solicitude for those to whom he writes, the same deep concern for the welfare of believers. "The personal reference to individuals, as well as the minute acquaintance with their movements and condition, are such as to defy the act of a forger." Bishop Ellicott has written, "In reference to the genuineness and authenticity of this Epistle, with which that of the other Pastoral Epistles is intimately connected, we may briefly remark, (a) that there was never any doubt entertained in the ancient Church that these Epistles were written by St. Paul, and (b) that of the objections urged by modern skepticism, the only one of any real importance — the peculiarities of phrases and expressions — may be so completely removed by a just consideration of the date of the Epistle, the peculiar nature of the subjects discussed, and the plain, substantial accordance in all main points with the Apostle's general style (admitted even by De Wette), that no doubt of the authorship ought now to be entertained by any calm and reasonable inquirer."[64]

Thus looking at the external and internal evidence, as well as at the objections urged, we cannot but conclude that the position of these Epistles remains unaltered. Beyond all doubt they came

[64] Commentary on Pastoral Epistles.

from Paul's own hand. They stand or fall together, and surely we have every reason to believe that they form a true part of the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture.

II. The Person Addressed.

This is Timothy, a native of Lystra, whose mother Eunice was a Jewess and whose father was a Greek. He was doubtless converted by Paul on his first missionary journey (Acts 16 : 1). When Paul and Silas came to Lystra on the second missionary journey, they took Timothy with them. From that time forward he was Paul's constant companion, and became bound to him by many endearing ties. The Apostle frequently sent him on commissions to the Churches, but as a rule he remained by the side of his spiritual father. The fact that from youth Timothy had been instructed in the Scriptures (2 Tim. 3 : 15), shows that his Jewish mother had not neglected her duty to him. And not only did he have a godly mother, but his grandmother Lois was also a woman of faith. This early training played no small part in preparing Timothy for his life work. He is associated with Paul in the salutations of the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. He was not with the Apostle when he went to Jerusalem and was arrested there, but at Rome he evidently spent most of his time with Paul. After Paul's release from his first Roman imprisonment, he and Timothy traveled together to Ephesus. It was to him as temporarily, at least, at the head of the Ephesian Church that Paul wrote the two Epistles.

The Second Epistle, written when he was a prisoner the second time at Rome, enjoins him to come speedily to him. Leaving the Church at Ephesus in temporary hands, Timothy probably hastened to Rome in obedience to Paul's request, and was able, we may hope, to minister to Paul in his last hours.

As no reference is made to Timothy's father in the Acts, except to state that he was a Greek, it has been inferred that he had died in Timothy's childhood. This left the early training of the young man in the hands of his godly mother and grandmother. "It would be natural that a character thus fashioned should retain throughout something of a feminine piety. A constitution far from robust (1 Tim. 5 : 23), a morbid shrinking from opposition and responsibility (1 Tim. 4 : 12–16 ; 5 : 20, 21 ; 6 : 11–14 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 1–7), a sensitiveness even to tears (2 Tim. 1 : 4), a tendency to ascetic vigor which he had not strength to bear (1 Tim. 5 : 23), united, as it often is, with a temperament exposed to some risk from "youthful lusts" (2 Tim. 2 : 22), and the softer emotions (1 Tim. 5 : 2), these we may well think of as characterizing the youth as they afterwards characterized the man."[65] The Apostle conceived the deepest love for Timothy, while Timothy in turn as a son with a father served with Paul in the Gospel (Phil. 2 : 22). If he had not had peculiar qualifications for the position, Paul would not have placed him at the head of the Ephesian Church, elevating him above many who were older than he. He is referred to repeatedly as a young man, but he stood in the

[65] Plumptre on Timothy in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

character of the Apostle's vicar — a position that involved great responsibilities. It is not surprising therefore that Paul should regard him in the light that he did. Tradition assigns Timothy to the bishopric of the Ephesian Church after Paul's death, and asserts that he died a martyr's death late in the first century.

III. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

This Epistle was occasioned by the fact that Paul had been suddenly called to Macedonia, where he found he would be delayed longer than he had expected. Timothy had been left in charge of the Ephesian Church, and Paul felt the necessity of communicating with him because of his delayed return to Ephesus. The object of the Epistle was twofold; first, to exhort Timothy to counteract the developing heresies of the time, and, secondly, to instruct him in all the particulars of his duties as overseer in charge for the time being of the Ephesian Church.

IV. The Outline of the Epistle.[66]

I. Salutation. 1 : 1, 2.

II. Reminds Timothy of the exhortation he had given him to silence the false teachers. 1 : 3–20.

1. Personal charge to Timothy. 1 : 3–5.
2. Explains the evil nature of the heresy. 1 : 6–11.
3. Personal justification for assuming authority in this matter. 1 : 12–17.
4. His choice of Timothy for his work. 1 : 18–20.

[66] This outline is from Professor Warfield. See Presbyterian *Review*, October, 1887.

III. Directions to Timothy to order the Church life in Ephesus. 2 : 1–4 : 11.

1. With reference to the public worship of the Church. 2 : 1–15.
   (*a.*) Duty of universal supplication explained. 2 : 1–7.
   (*b.*) Proper manner in public prayer. 2 : 8–10.
   (*c.*) General command that women should keep silence in these services given, and justified. 2 : 11–15.
2. With reference to the choice of proper men for official position in the Church. 3 : 1–13.
   (*a.*) Requirements for ordination of bishops. 3 : 1–7.
   (*b.*) The same of deacons. 3 : 8–13.
3. Importance of these directions as to church services and officers. 3 : 14–4 : 11.
   (*a.*) Nature of the Church as God's house and church. 3 : 14, 15.
   (*b.*) Function of the Church as the pillar and ground of the truth. 3 : 15, 16.
   (*c.*) Danger impending over the truth from false teachers. 4 : 1–11.

IV. Personal exhortations to Timothy. 4 : 12–6 : 2.

1. Duty to himself and his position. 4 : 12–16.
2. His proper attitude toward various classes. 5 : 1–6 : 2.
   (*a.*) Old and young of both sexes. 5 : 1, 2.
   (*b.*) Widows. 5 : 3–16.
   (*c.*) Presbyters. 5 : 17–25.
   (*d.*) Slaves. 6 : 1, 2.

V. Concluding warnings to Timothy against the dangerous elements in the Church. 6 : 3–19, in which he

1. describes the character of the false teachers, 6 : 3–5,
2. expounds the true relation of godliness and wealth, 6 : 6–10,
3. exhorts Timothy, 6 : 11–16,
4. and through him the rich members of the Church, 6 : 17–19.
5. Again exhorts Timothy to keep the faith and avoid error. 6 : 20–21.
6. Benediction. 6 : 21.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

On examining this Epistle it is evident that Paul had been in Ephesus a short time before it was written (1 : 3), that he had been suddenly called to go to Macedonia, and that he had left Timothy in charge of the Church during his absence. It is also manifest that Paul expected to return again to Ephesus before long, although his return might be delayed for a time. When Paul left Ephesus on his third missionary journey (Acts 20 : 1, 2), Timothy had been sent to Macedonia (Acts 19 : 22), and to Corinth (1 Cor. 4 : 17). And when Paul wrote Second Corinthians from Macedonia, Timothy was with him (2 Cor. 1 : 1). From this it can be seen that the events referred to in this Epistle do not correspond with the facts in connection with the other departures of Paul from Ephesus. Nor can we find a place for this absence of Paul from Ephesus during the three years' residence (Acts 20 : 31) in that city. There is

no place then for the facts referred to in this Epistle earlier than after the release of Paul from his first Roman imprisonment. This places as the limits of the time of its composition, the summer of 63 A. D., and that of 68 A. D., when the Apostle was martyred at Rome. 66 A. D. has been suggested as possibly the date when Paul returned from Spain to Asia Minor. The journey to Macedonia was made probably in the summer of 67 A. D., and during it this Epistle was written. The postscript that it "was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest city of Phrygia Pacatiana," is therefore manifestly incorrect, for the Epistle was written from some point in Macedonia.

VI. Peculiarities of the Epistle.

The First Epistle to Timothy is not merely a personal letter, as Philemon, or even Second Timothy, but is an official communication by the Apostle to his vicar at Ephesus. Personal matters of course are touched upon, but they are merely incidental to the main purpose of the Epistle. This Epistle, as well as the others of the group, deals not so much with doctrine, although it emphasizes the need of sound doctrine, as it does with matters that pertain to the organization and government of the Church. In the earlier Epistles the doctrinal foundation is laid for the Church; in these Epistles attention is paid rather to the superstructure. "The great theme in these Epistles is the application of the Gospel to outward conduct." The special peculiarity of this group is their attention to the matter of the Church government.

XII. THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

I. Canonicity.

The *external* testimony to this Epistle includes Clement of Rome (96), the Epistle to Diognetus (117), Justin Martyr (145), the heretic Tatian (150), who received this Epistle but rejected the two to Timothy, and Theophilus of Antioch (168). The Muratori Canon (170), the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions contain it. Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195),— all of these quote it by name, ascribing it to Paul. The *internal* evidence in regard to these Pastoral Epistles has already been examined under First Timothy. It is worthy of note that a number of critics who reject First Timothy, acknowledge Titus and Second Timothy to be Pauline. And there are none who accept either, or both of the Epistles to Timothy, who do not also accept Titus as well. Combining all this evidence with the claim of the Epistle itself, we may rest satisfied that it is a genuine Epistle of Paul.

II. The Person Addressed.

Titus, to whom this Epistle is addressed, is nowhere mentioned by name in the Acts, and all that we can learn of him must be gathered from the incidental allusions to him in Paul's Epistles. He was a Gentile, being a Greek by birth (Gal. 2 : 3). When Paul and Barnabas were appointed by the Antiochian Church to go up to Jerusalem to consult with the Apostles and elders there concerning the controversy that had arisen regarding circumcision (Acts 15 : 2), Titus accompanied them (Gal. 2 : 1). In regard to him

Paul took a decided stand, and would not permit his circumcision because he was a Gentile,— the point at issue being the relation of the Gentiles to the law. The expression "mine own son after the common faith," shows that he was a convert of Paul's. He became a Christian before the Council of Jerusalem in 50 A. D. The next time he appears in the history is in connection with the Corinthian church. Paul calls him his "partner and fellow-helper," indicating that they had become closely associated in their work. Titus was the bearer of the First Epistle to the Corinthians in the Spring of the year 57 A. D. Shortly after his departure on that errand, Paul also left Ephesus and went to Troas, where he had hoped to meet Titus on his return from Corinth with a report of the reception of that Epistle (2 Cor. 2:13). Not meeting him there, the Apostle in his great anxiety to hear the news, pressed on into Macedonia, where at some point Titus met him and gave him a full account of the effect of the First Epistle on the Corinthians (2 Cor. 7 : 6). Immediately Paul wrote his Second Epistle to the same people, and sent Titus back with it at his own request, authorizing him at the same time to complete the collection for the benefit of the poor saints at Jerusalem, which on his previous visit Titus had begun, and which seems to have been somewhat under his care (2 Cor. 8 : 6, 16, 17).

From that time on (Summer of 57 A. D.), Titus does not appear in the history at all until some years after the release of Paul from his first imprisonment in Rome. It was possibly the Summer of 67 A. D. when Paul took Titus with him to the island of

Crete, where his presence was needed to reform the abuses that had arisen among the Christians on that island. The Apostle was accompanied by Titus, but it is apparent that he was for some reason unable to remain long enough in Crete to complete the work that it was necessary to accomplish, and consequently he left Titus behind him to complete that which he had been compelled to leave in an unfinished condition. That Titus' stay in Crete was to be only temporary is clearly proven by the directions Paul sends to him to join him as soon as possible at Nicopolis in Epirus, where Paul was then expecting to spend the following Winter. In this Epistle he is enjoined to hasten to Paul just as soon as Artemas or Tychicus should come to Crete to take his place. In 2 Tim. 4 : 10 Paul wrote, "Titus is departed to Dalmatia," and from this we infer that he had joined Paul at Nicopolis, and from thence he had been sent on some mission up into Dalmatia. This is the last reference we have to this consecrated worker for Christ.

In comparison with Timothy, we may infer from the duties laid upon Titus, that he was the more energetic and stronger character of the two. 2 Cor. 12 : 18 contains an implied assertion of the strict integrity of Titus. The delicate and difficult mission that was his in connection with the delivery of the First Epistle to the Corinthians gives evidence of Paul's high estimate of his ability to rebuke the abuses that had arisen there. In it he was quite successful (2 Cor. 7 : 7, 15). He was a man of great zeal and sympathy, grieving over what was evil and rejoicing over what was good (2 Cor. 7 : 7, 13, 15).

In regard to the duties imposed on him in reforming the abuses in Crete and in appointing elders and completing the organization of the churches there, "we see not only the confidence reposed in him by the Apostle, but the need there was of determination and strength of purpose, and therefore the probability that this was his character." Tradition makes Titus the first Bishop of Crete, but this does not harmonize with the manifestly temporary character of his work on that island. His duty was to complete the work begun by Paul and then hasten to the Apostle.

The island of Crete is one of the largest of the islands of the Mediterranean. Upon it a great many Jews resided. "The character which the Apostle gives of the Cretans is far from being complimentary. He quotes the words of one of their own poets, and asserts that this testimony was true: 'The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.' This testimony is abundantly corroborated by similar assertions from ancient writers." That Christianity had penetrated this island some time previous to Paul's visit is evident. Cretans were in Jerusalem at the time of the great Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and on their return home they must have carried the truth with them. The organization of their churches was incomplete, and they probably had never had any apostolic supervision until Paul came to them. The heresies assailed in this Epistle were of Jewish and not of Gnostic origin. Paul touched at this island on his way to Rome as a prisoner in 60 A. D., but his stay

was so short that he very probably had no personal contact with the Christians there. Huther describes the heretics referred to in the Epistle in the following words: "The heretics (1 : 9) belong especially to Judaism (1 : 10). While boasting of their special knowledge of God, they lead a godless life (1 : 16), condemned by their own consciences (3 : 11). What they bring forward are Jewish myths (1 : 14), genealogies, points of controversy about the law (3 : 9), and mere commandments of man (1 : 14). They are idle babblers (1 : 10), who with their shameful doctrine (1 : 11) seduce hearts (1 : 10), cause divisions in the church (3 : 10), and draw whole families into destruction (1 : 11); and all this — for the sake of shameful gain" (1 : 11).[67]

III. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

Paul desired to give Titus some further instruction in regard to his superintendency of the Cretan churches, as well as to summon him to Nicopolis. The Apostle's design in writing, therefore, was principally to give instruction in regard to the selection and appointments of office-bearers. Another design was "to instruct and charge Titus to refute and oppose false teachers. It is more than probable that Titus had met with much opposition; several despised him, and others openly attacked him. Paul, therefore, by this Epistle, invests him with his apostolic authority, and commands him to exhort and convince gainsayers, to stop the mouths of vain talkers and deceivers, to rebuke them

[67] Huther in Meyer's Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles.

sharply, and to reject heretics, if not brought to repentance after two admonitions."[68]

IV. Outline of the Epistle.

1. Salutation. 1 : 1–4.
2. His purpose in leaving Titus at Crete. 1 : 5, 6.
3. Qualifications of bishops. 1 : 7–9.
4. Necessity for these qualifications. 1 : 10.
5. Description of the false teachers. 1 : 11–16.
6. Special rules for various classes. 2 : 1–15.
   (1.) The old and young. 2 : 1–6.
   (2.) Exhortation to Titus that he should be a pattern of all good works. 2 : 7, 8.
   (3.) Slaves. 2 : 9, 10.
   (4.) Basis for these rules found in the purpose of the work of Christ. 2 : 11–15.
7. Sundry commands to Christians. 3 : 1–8.
   (1.) To be subject to their rulers. 3 : 1.
   (2.) To be gentle and kind to all men, because this is in keeping with God's purpose in them. 3 : 2–8.
8. Injunctions to Titus. 3 : 9–11.
   (1.) To avoid useless disputes. 3 : 9.
   (2.) To excommunicate determined errorists. 3 : 10, 11.
9. Concluding instructions and benediction. 3 : 12–15.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

The data furnished by this Epistle itself which help to determine this question are : the Apostle had shortly before its composition been on the island of Crete, where upon his departure he had left Titus ;

[68] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 416.

and it was his expectation to spend the following Winter at Nicopolis, in Epirus. Attempts have been made to find a place for this trip and for the composition of this Epistle during the three years spent at Ephesus, 54–57 A. D. But it is to be noted that the great dissimilarity between this Epistle and the acknowledged Epistles of that period is positively against this idea. The earlier Epistles have nothing to say directly about the qualifications of church officers, or concerning matters that pertain to the organization and government of the Church. This feature alone would forbid the early date assigned by some to this Epistle. But it may also be asked, When during the Ephesian residence had Paul any idea of spending the following Winter at Nicopolis? He expected to spend the Winter of 57–58 A. D. at Corinth (1 Cor. 16:6; Acts 20:1–3), but no reference is made in either the Acts or the Epistles of that earlier period to any expectation of spending a Winter at Nicopolis. There is no place in the Acts for the composition of this Epistle, for it comes several years later.

First Timothy has already been dated during the early Summer of 67 A. D. Leaving Titus at Crete, the Apostle returned to Ephesus in the latter part of the same season. This Epistle was written before the following Winter set in, and either at Ephesus or else on the way to Nicopolis. The postscript in the English Bible affirms that it was written from Nicopolis of Macedonia. But this is certainly incorrect, for the Apostle does not seem to have reached his objective point when he wrote this Epistle. He may have been *en route*, but it is very probable that

he would have mentioned the fact of his arrival at his journey's end, if he had actually reached that point. The date of this Epistle accordingly is the Fall of 67 A. D., and the place of its composition was probably the city of Ephesus, or possibly at some point between there and the Nicopolis to which the Apostle was going. Of all the places named Nicopolis, and there were at least seven of them, the Nicopolis in Epirus is the one which the large majority of scholars have settled upon as the one named by Paul.

As Paul speaks in 2 Tim. 4 : 12 of having sent Tychicus (or of sending him) to Ephesus, we may doubtless infer that Artemas was the person whom he eventually chose to occupy Titus' place in Crete (Titus 3 : 12). It has been inferred that Zenas and Apollos mentioned in 3 : 13 were the bearers of this Epistle to its destination, but it seems rather that they were with Titus when this letter was written. Artemas may have been the bearer of the Epistle, although we are not able to affirm this absolutely.

XIII. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

I. Canonicity.

Barnabas (106), Ignatius (115), and Polycarp (116) most certainly adopt certain phrases from this Epistle. Heracleon (150) refers to a passage in it. It is contained in the Muratori Canon (170), as well as in the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) Versions. Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195) quote it by name. This *external* evidence is

so strong that many who reject First Timothy accept this Epistle. There are comparatively few critics in modern times who reject it. In regard to the *internal* evidence, Professor Salmon writes, "In the case of the Second Epistle to Timothy, the marks of Pauline origin are so strong that I do not think that any Epistle can with more confidence be asserted to be the Apostle's work."[69] Reuss affirms that "of all the Pauline Epistles which criticism has attacked, none (save that to Philemon) bears the stamp of genuineness so plainly as this, provided one keeps in mind the circumstances under which it must have been written."[70] And the same critic also writes that "the whole Epistle is so completely the natural expression of the actual situation of the author, and contains, unsought and for the most part in the form of mere allusions, such a mass of minute and unessential particulars, that even did the name of the writer not chance to be mentioned at the beginning it would be easy to discover it."[70]

The style of the Epistle, as well as its historical references and allusions, proclaim its genuineness. None but Paul himself could possibly have written it, for Paul is the only one who could have been so intimately acquainted with the persons named in the letter as to have described their conditions and movements. "Genuineness is stamped upon the letter throughout, so clearly and unmistakably that we cannot for a moment entertain the idea of its being a forgery."

[69] Salmon's Introd. to the N. T., p. 503.

[70] Reuss' History of the N. T., Vol. I., p. 121.

II. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

When the Apostle wrote this Epistle, he was in prison in Rome for the second time. His confinement during his first imprisonment had not been as severe, for although he was then chained all the time to a Roman soldier, he had been permitted to dwell in his own hired house, where those who desired to see him could have access to him at any time. But now he is kept under close surveillance in some prison, so that when Onesiphorus came to Rome, he had to search diligently for the Apostle before he found him (2 Tim. 1 : 16–18). Formerly he had been surrounded by friends and workers, who had unrestricted approach to him ; but now he is practically alone, with the exception of the faithful, beloved physician Luke, who would not desert him even though his condition was so much changed from what it had been. Titus and Crescens are absent on duty (4 : 10). The allusion to Tychicus is a little obscure, and may mean that he is absent also, or, as some maintain, he is sending this Epistle by his hand.[71] Demas had deserted the Apostle, and Paul reminds Timothy that, as he knew, "all that are in Asia turned away from me" (2 Tim. 1 : 15, R. V.), doubtless meaning that at the time of his arrest either at Troas or at Ephesus, they had deserted him. The Apostle, therefore, feels his position keenly, the defections having made the confinement all the harder to bear.

Paul also informs Timothy, "At my first defense no man took my part, but all forsook me" (2 Tim. 4 : 16).

[71] The epistolary aorist is probably used here, and it means, "And Tychicus I am sending (or, I send herewith) to Ephesus."

The reference here is in all probability to his first preliminary trial, when he was delivered from the lion's mouth. "He was acquitted, then, on the first charge of the indictment, which perhaps accused him of conspiring with the incendiaries of Rome. He was delivered from the immediate peril, and saved from the ignominious and painful death which might have been his doom had he been convicted on such a charge." Paul had been remanded to prison to await his final trial. In that approaching trial he evidently does not expect acquittal, for he writes, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand" (2 Tim. 4 : 6).

How natural that he should desire to see Timothy once more ere death should come to his release! So he writes to Timothy to hasten to him, urging him to come before another Winter should set in.[72] He also enjoins him to bring Mark, for by his faithfulness Mark had restored himself fully to Paul's favor and confidence, both of which he had forfeited by his deserting the Apostle on the first missionary journey (Acts 15 : 38). Timothy is also to bring the cloak, books, and parchments the Apostle had left at Troas. "As, however, his fate was uncertain, and as he might not survive until the arrival of Timothy, he writes this Epistle with a view to stir up and encourage that Evangelist in his ministry; he exhorts him not to be ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, to stand up boldly for the faith,

[72] The winter of 2 Tim. 4 : 21 I now believe was the same as that of Titus 3 : 12. This necessitates dating 2 Timothy in 67 A. D., and not in 68 A. D., as held in my first edition.

and to endure hardship as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, and he warns him against these false teachers, who were perverting the minds of the disciples, eating as a canker into the very heart of religion. This Epistle, then, is a pastoral charge of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, primarily designed for Timothy, but applicable to all ministers and to all congregations in the Christian Church."[73]

III. Contents of the Epistle.

This is a private letter, and not like the first, an official communication. As such it partakes of the freedom of a private and personal letter. It does not admit of formal divisions.

1. Greeting. 1 : 1, 2.
2. Thanksgiving. 1 : 3–5.
3. Exhortation to steadfastness in the Gospel. 1 : 6–14.
4. The kindness of Onesiphorus. 1 : 15–18.
5. Continued exhortations and rules for conduct. 2 : 1–26.
6. Warnings against false teachers. 3 : 1–13.
7. Again urges Timothy to be steadfast, and to live according to the inspired Scriptures, with description of the uses of the Scriptures. 3 : 14–17.
8. A solemn charge, with prophecy of the future developments of heresy. 4 : 1–5.
9. Personal details. 4 : 6–22.
   (*a.*) Consciousness of approaching death. 4 : 6–8.
   (*b.*) Commands Timothy to hasten to him. 4 : 9.

[73] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 426.

(*c.*) Paul's loneliness consequent on the desertions of some, and the absence of others on duty. 4 : 10–15.
(*d.*) Results of his first trial. 4: 16–18.
(*e.*) Salutations and benediction. 4 : 19–22.

IV. Date and Place of Composition.

Concerning the place of composition, none can deny that it was Rome. It is manifestly the last Epistle written by the aged Apostle. It could not have been written during the first imprisonment, for when he wrote to the Philippians, he expected to be released and to see them soon again ; but now as he writes, the only release he expects is that of death. What has already been written concerning the date of the other two Pastoral Epistles confirms our belief that this Epistle was written near the end of Paul's life and during his second imprisonment. All the references in this Epistle to his imprisonment show that he is in a very different position than he was during his former imprisonment.

When he wrote the Epistle to Titus he was probably at Ephesus. Leaving there in the Fall of 67 A. D., he journeyed to Nicopolis. His expected sojourn there for that Winter was cut short by apparent dangers. Leaving Nicopolis, he fled across Macedonia to Troas, at which point, or possibly after he had arrived at Ephesus from Troas, he was apprehended and taken with all haste to Rome.[74] Since the burning of Rome in 64 A. D., all Christians were liable to arrest at any moment. Informers (delatores)

[74] Conybeare and Howson believe that at this point he was arrested and taken to Rome, that he had left the articles at Troas, mentioned in 4 : 13, when he returned from Macedonia to Ephesus after writing

were encouraged to bring charges of any kind against Christians, and credence was readily given to any information against them. It may be that Alexander the coppersmith (4 : 14) was the one at whose accusation he was arrested. This man may have been the Alexander whose excommunication he had secured (1 Tim. 1 : 20), and who took this way of revenge. At Rome the Apostle was incarcerated in a chill and gloomy prison. And when he wrote his Epistle, he had had his first preliminary trial.

Taking all these things into consideration, the most probable date for this Epistle is in the Fall of 67 A.D. Probably before the next Spring his final trial came up. The noble Apostle to the Gentiles was condemned, and he was accorded the death of a Roman citizen, that of beheading. With calm and exultant faith he looks forward to his release from the burdens and cares of this life. "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith ; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day." On some day in May, 68 A. D., according to tradition, the Apostle was led outside of the eternal city on the Ostian road, and beheaded. Thus he departed and was with Christ.

V. Peculiarities of the Epistle.

The peculiar characteristic of this Epistle is that it was the last one of the great Apostle. It is his

1 Tim. With this I cannot agree, for I do not think he was likely to have left these articles that he valued so much there for almost a year without having sent for them. It seems to me that he had left them there only a few weeks before he wrote this Epistle.

dying advice, written in the face of impending martyrdom. Nowhere does his noble manhood stand forth in clearer light than here. What pathos, what faith, what courage, what hope, shine forth in every line of his imperishable letter! "He looked forward calmly to the grave, and, with the executioner's ax in the foreground, he pens this letter to his favorite disciple; he solemnly charges him before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom, to be faithful to the charge committed to him (2 Tim. 4 : 1, 2). We see here the very heart of Paul,— his affection for Timothy, his unquenchable zeal for the promotion of Christ's kingdom, the calmness with which he looks forward to the grave, the confidence with which he looks upward to heaven. Now old in years, and worn out with many trials, deserted in a great measure by his friends, he waits with calmness and with a certain degree of satisfaction his approaching martyrdom, His longing desire to see Timothy, the urgency with which he entreats him to come to him with all diligence, the sadness with which he mentions the desertion of his friends, the feeling of loneliness, the craving after human sympathy in this the hour of his trial, are all natural touches of the state of Paul's feelings, and vividly represent him before us as one who, although standing on the verge of heaven, was not yet raised above the common feelings of humanity." [75]

[75] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 435.

CHAPTER VII.

The Epistle to the Hebrews.

Having finished our study of the acknowledged Epistles of Paul, it is natural to take up next the study of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In no place does this Epistle make any claim to Pauline authorship, its title really being "To the Hebrews" without any specification as to its author. It differs from the thirteen other Epistles in that they all somewhere explicitly claim to be Pauline. This one does not, either in its title or in its body. The majority of critics do not accept it as a Pauline Epistle. And it is to be noted that even if it could be conclusively proved that its author was not Paul, this fact would not militate against its canonicity.

I. Canonicity.

The first witness to be summoned is Clement of Rome (96), whose letter to the Corinthians is saturated with the language and thoughts of this Epistle. He directly quotes it several times, although not by name; while he makes repeated allusions to it. In one place he quotes it with the formula, "for so it is written," and by doing so shows that he regarded it as authoritative Scripture. Had he any doubts about its canonical authority, he could not possibly have used it as he does. Eusebius, commenting on Clem-

ent's use of this Epistle, says that Clement "after giving many sentiments taken from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and also literally quoting the words, most clearly shows that this work is not a late production. Hence it is probable that this also was numbered with the other writings of the Apostle."[1] It is true that he does not ascribe it to Paul, but neither does he do so in regard to acknowledged Pauline Epistles, except First Corinthians. Bishop Westcott writes, "It is not too much to say that it [this Epistle] was wholly transfused into Clement's mind." Justin Martyr (145) unquestionably uses it, quoting "it as a scriptural authority of equal rank with the book of Genesis." It is probably quoted by Aristides (138–161) in his apology. Marcion (130) omitted it from his list, and it is not contained in the Muratori Canon (170). But both the Syriac (160) and Old Latin (170) versions include it. Clement of Alexandria repeatedly quotes it, ascribing it to Paul. According to Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria asserts that Pantænus (185) affirmed its Pauline authorship. By the whole Eastern Church this Epistle was accepted as having canonical authority.

As to the Western Church, it is evident that, with the notable exception of Clement of Rome, it was during the latter part of the second, and throughout the third century, against the canonical authority of this Epistle. Among those who denied this are Tertullian, Cyprian, and Irenæus. At the beginning of the fourth century, there was a decided reaction in its favor, led by such men as Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose of Milan. "At the end of the fourth

[1] Eusebius H. E. 3 : 38.

century, Jerome, the most learned and critical of the Latin Fathers, reviewed the conflicting opinions as to the authority of this Epistle. He considered that the prevailing, though not universal, view of the Latin Churches was of less weight than the views, not only of ancient writers, but also of all Greek and all the Eastern Churches, where the Epistle was received as canonical and read daily; and he pronounced a decided opinion in favor of its authority. The great contemporary light of North Africa, St. Augustine, held a similar opinion. And after the declaration of these two eminent men, the Latin Churches united with the East in receiving the Epistle. The third Council of Carthage (A. D. 397) gave final confirmation to their decision."[2]

Summing up the external evidence, it may be affirmed that the canonical authority of the Epistle was recognized all over the Church, with the exception of the Latin Churches from the end of the second to the end of the fourth centuries. No Greek or Syrian writer expresses any personal doubt in this matter. The Latin Church seems to have held to the idea that apostolic authorship, or at least apostolic indorsement, was essential to canonical authority. And as that portion of the Church denied its Pauline authorship, it was led likewise to deny its canonicity. The doubts all arose in connection with the uncertainty of authorship. But, as has been noted, that portion of the Church swung into line by the end of the fourth century, and positively affirmed its canonical authority in harmony with the belief of all the other sections of the Church. As to the

[2] Prof. Thayer, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, p. 1024.

internal evidence, Alford says that "nowhere are the main doctrines of the faith more purely or more majestically set forth; nowhere is Holy Scripture urged with greater authority and cogency."

In all probability the canonical authority of this Epistle would never have been questioned had it not been for the uncertainty of authorship. But even this uncertainty ought never to have occasioned doubts as to its canonicity. We may then feel satisfied that, whatever decision may eventually be arrived at in regard to its author, its canonical authority is now unassailable. The Epistle by its own inherent worth won its way into the acceptance of the Church universal, because no cogent reasons could be found for rejecting it from the sacred canon. Professor Thayer writes that "the canonical authority of the Epistle is secure so far as it can be established by the tradition of the Christian Church. The doubts which affected it were admitted in remote places, or in the failure of knowledge, or under the pressure of times of intellectual excitement; and they have disappeared before full information and calm judgment."

II. Its Authorship.

This is one of the most difficult questions that meets the student in the New Testament Introduction. A vast mass of literature has been written on this subject, and the probabilities are that we must all agree with the verdict of Origen, who, while apparently accepting it as practically a Pauline Epistle, says, "Who wrote the Epistle, God only knows certainly." So far as the external testimony

is concerned, Paul is the only person who receives enough support to be considered. The testimony of Tertullian in favor of Barnabas is the only exception to this. Luke and Clement of Rome, it is true, have been mentioned, but only as editors or translators rather than as independent authors. The received tradition and popular belief of the East was that Paul wrote it. The first direct witness in favor of Pauline authorship is Pantænus (185). It is Clement of Alexandria who informs us of this fact, and he in turn, without expressing a single doubt as to its Pauline authorship, states that Paul wrote this Epistle in Hebrew and that Luke translated it into Greek. In this way he accounts for its dissimilarity from Paul's other Epistles. Origen, who quotes this Epistle more than two hundred times, has no personal doubts as to its authorship, but he refers to the doubts of others. He suggests that "the thoughts are the Apostle's, but the diction and the phraseology belong to some one who wrote down what the Apostle said." He affirms that the ancient men "delivered it as coming from Paul," but at the same time he confesses, "who wrote the Epistle, God only knows certainly." Dionysius of Alexandria (247) maintains its Pauline origin. The historian Eusebius (315) speaks of the fourteen Epistles of Paul, and he classed it among the "acknowledged" books. Eusebius adopts the explanation of Clement of Alexandria, as to the cause of its differences from the other Pauline Epistles. After this time the Eastern Church without a dissenting voice held to its Pauline authorship.

On the other hand Tertullian affirms that Barnabas was its author. Caius of Rome (210) and Hippolytus (220) deny explicitly its Pauline authorship. Irenæus, though quoting it in a work now lost, does not, so far as we know, have anything to say about its author. Cyprian (248) seems to exclude it, but makes no certain allusions to it. Davidson sums up the patristic evidence in the following words: "In the Western or Latin Church the Epistle was not regarded as apostolic or Pauline down to the fourth century.[3] During this century, however, it obtained a canonical position, and was attributed to Paul; so that in the latter part of it and afterwards, the Epistle was firmly established in ecclesiastical opinion among the authentic writings of the Apostle. The causes which contributed to this change of sentiment in the Western Church, if it can be properly called a change, cannot be exactly traced. Perhaps the study of Origen's writings had its influence. We know that Hilary and Ambrose in particular were conversant with and largely influenced by these. The ecclesiastical intercourse, too, between the East and West, that began to be held at this time, must have brought the sentiments of the East into the West. Above all, the weight of two names, Jerome and Augustine, contributed largely to the formation of such an opinion. When these distinguished Fathers quoted and used it as the Apostle's authentic production, inferior writers might well do the same."[4]

[3] These words ought to have been modified by the unquestioned acceptance of it by Clement of Rome, who uses it as authoritative scripture.

[4] First Edition, Vol. III., p. 195.

The East was undoubtedly more critical than the West. And it is manifest that where the East gave expression to its opinion, it was in favor of the Pauline authorship. To the weight of this opinion the West finally and completely yielded. So much for the external testimony in this matter.

What now about the internal testimony? And it is just here that the opponents of Pauline authorship put forth their strongest arguments. But the argument from style is always precarious, unless backed up by other considerations. Here we find equally learned and acute critics arrayed against one another; some asserting, others denying, Pauline authorship. It is not denied that the theology of the Epistle is Pauline, but it is claimed by some that the general style of composition forbids Pauline authorship. On the other hand it has been confidently affirmed "that the things which have been urged against the hypothesis of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, are, on the contrary, in perfect harmony with it; some of them, indeed, supplying confirmatory proofs of it."

It has been objected against its Pauline authorship, (1.) that there is the lack of the usual inscription of Paul's name. In the other thirteen Epistles the Apostle's name is prefixed, but here it is not. But, it may be answered, that the object and destination of the Epistle will account for this omission. The very mention of his name by the Apostle, since he was the Apostle to the Gentiles, might have interfered with its purpose. Clement of Alexandria accounts for this omission "by supposing that the Apostle

prudently refrained from obtruding on the Hebrews a name which, he knew, was unwelcome to them." (2.) It is objected that Paul would not be likely to write an Epistle to the Jews, since his mission was to the Gentiles. But Paul's solicitude for his brethren according to the flesh is well known. If he could write, "I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh" (Rom. 9: 3), surely he could also write an Epistle to some of them. (3.) It is held that Heb. 2: 3 can only be interpreted as meaning that the writer had not heard the Lord Jesus speak the words of truth in the flesh. But the Apostle, while distinctly claiming that he had received his credentials to preach, as well as his knowledge of the truth, from Christ, and not from man, never claims that he had seen Him in the flesh. These words do not necessarily conflict with his statements elsewhere in regard to the visions and revelations he had had.

But that upon which the opponents of Pauline authorship lay the greatest stress is the dissimilarity in style from the other Epistles of Paul. There is no question of the great difference there is in this respect. Delitzsch writes that "the language is more oratorical than dialectic, not so excited and lively as in the Epistle to the Galatians, not pressing forward with such quick, triumphant step as in the Epistle to the Romans, not so unrestrained and superabundant as in that to the Ephesians, but characterized throughout by conscious repose, dignified solemnity, and majestic quietude."[5] In the words of

[5] Delitzsch on Hebrews, Eng. Tr., Vol. I., p. 3.

Dean Alford, "The main difference for us, which will also set forth the characteristic peculiarity of this Epistle, is, that whereas Paul is ever, as it were, struggling with the scantiness of human speech to pour forth his crowding thoughts, thereby falling into rhetorical and grammatical irregularities, the style of our Epistle flows regularly on, with no such suspended constructions."[6] But in this connection it must be remembered that there are great differences in style between other and acknowledged Epistles of the Apostle. The occasion and the subject must be allowed to dominate and fix the style of an Epistle. The Apostle may have taken, and undoubtedly did take, much more care than usual in the composition of this Epistle. Dr. Kay[7] gives a list of seventeen words that are peculiar to this Epistle and the speeches and other letters of Paul, that are found nowhere else in the New Testament. There are also thirty-four other words that are found only here and in Paul's other Epistles. The same writer shows that there are "words in the Epistle which are seldom used in the New Testament by any except Paul, but which he uses frequently, or with some peculiarity of manner." A man with such versatility of mind as Paul had did not have to write in exactly the same style every time he wrote a letter. He may have taken special pains in the composition of this Epistle. "The inaccuracy of Paul's Greek does not arise from defective knowledge of the language, but from a certain carelessness of style arising from the

[6] Alford's Gk. Test., Vol. IV., Prolegomena, p. 79.
[7] Bible Commentary, Introd. to Hebrews.

fervor of his spirit." In the more epistolary parts of this Epistle the style of Paul is quite pronounced. And the very subject of the Epistle will in large part account for its marked peculiarities. That the influence of Paul's modes of thought and expression is manifest, none can or do deny. There are many phenomena in it that are in perfect harmony with Pauline authorship, and these ought to be given their due weight.

The position of this Epistle in the great MSS. is worthy of special note in this connection. In the English Bible it is placed after the thirteen Epistles of Paul. But in the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and Vatican MSS., it is placed immediately after Second Thessalonians and before the Pastoral Epistles. In the Vatican MS., there is evidence that it stood after Galatians in an earlier MS. The weight, then, of the MSS., is decidedly in favor of Pauline authorship, inasmuch as they place it among, and not after, the acknowledged Epistles, as our English Version does.

Doctrinal differences between this Epistle and the others have been asserted. But this arises from the entire omission of references to themes prominent in other Epistles. This is rather negative criticism, and surely new views of the truth, or omissions of certain customary doctrinal statements, are not inconsistent with Pauline authorship.

The writer of this Epistle must have been a Jew, and this fact alone would rule out Clement of Rome or Luke as possible authors of it. Barnabas was not suggested as its author until Tertullian's day, and Luther suggested

that Apollos was the author, but before Luther's day no one apparently thought of him in this connection. If we had any known writings from either Barnabas or Apollos, we might be in a position to speak definitely, but we have no such writings, and consequently it is only conjecture that can associate either of these names with its authorship. And if within one hundred and fifty years after the time of its composition, its authorship was largely a matter of conjecture, there is little reason for hope that the question can ever be definitely settled. With Dr. Gloag[8] we may say: "In summing up the internal evidence, it is difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion. The doctrines and phraseology of the Epistle point to a Pauline origin; whilst the want of inscription, and the mode of citation from the Old Testament, are un-Pauline. The great objection is the difference of style; but we must put against this difference the peculiar Pauline digressions with which the Epistle abounds. If the external evidence in favor of Paul had been stronger, we might have disregarded the internal; but still we think, taking all things into consideration, that the preponderance of evidence is in favor of a Pauline authorship; at least no person has yet been suggested as better entitled to be considered the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews."[9]

[8] Gloag's Introd. to the Pauline Epistles, p. 464.

[9] For a fuller investigation of this whole question, the reader is referred to the Introductions of Gloag, Davidson 1st Ed., Dr. Kay in the Bible Commentary, the article "Hebrews" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, the Commentaries of Lunemann (The Meyer Commentary), and Delitzsch, and all the other more elaborate Introductions. The strongest argument

III. To Whom Written.

It is addressed briefly "to the Hebrews." The voluminous discussion of this subject has resulted in a well-nigh unanimous verdict among scholars that it was written to Palestinian Jews, especially those of Jerusalem. "The whole tenor of the Epistle implies that the persons to whom it was written, lived under the shadow of the Temple services." Some have striven to prove that it was written to Alexandrian Jews, but the evidence is decidedly against this theory. How natural it was that Paul should write to those Jews among whom his early days had been spent by him as a zealot for the law!

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

"The Epistle to the Hebrews," writes Lunemann, "was occasioned by the danger to which the Christians in Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem, were exposed, of renouncing again their faith in Christ, and wholly falling back into Judaism (cf. specially 6:4–6; 10:26 ff.). This danger had become a very pressing one, inasmuch as many had already as a matter of fact ceased to frequent the Christian assemblies (10:25)."[10] The object of the Epistle was to strengthen and comfort his readers in their persecutions, and, at the same time, to warn them against the danger of apostasy to Judaism. "The Epis-

against the Pauline authorship of the Epistle is presented by Gardner in Vol. XIV. of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, prefacing the Homilies of Chrysostom on Hebrews.

[10] Lunemann in the Meyer Commentary on Hebrews.

tle aims, by the unfolding on every side of the sublimity of the Christian revelation as the perfect and archetypal, above that of the Old Testament as the merely preparatory and typical, as well as by setting forth the terrible consequences of an apostasy, to warn against such falling away, and to animate to a faithful perseverance in the Christian course."

V. The Outline of the Epistle.

Because of the importance of this Epistle, a fuller outline than usual seems in place. The following adheres closely to the analysis given by Dr. Weidner.[11]

1. In former revelations, God spoke through the prophets, but now He speaks in His Son. 1 : 1–3.

2. Who is superior to the angels. 1 : 4–14.

3. To whose message we ought to give the more earnest heed. 2 : 1–4.

4. By His incarnation the Son of God was brought lower than the angels and to the level of man for a time, that in the state of humiliation He might be a perfect Redeemer. 2 : 5–18.

5. As our High Priest, Jesus is superior to Moses. 3 : 1–6.

6. Let us not through unfaithfulness fail of the promises, but let us give due diligence to attain to them. 3 : 7–4 : 13.

7. Having such a merciful High Priest, let us through Him draw near to God. 4 : 14–16.

[11] Studies in the Book, Third Series.

8. Christ is the true High Priest, after the order of Melchizedec. 5 : 1–10.

9. Low spiritual attainments of his readers. 5 : 11–14.

10. Warning to them of the necessity of progress and of the peril of falling back. 6 : 1–8.

11. Encourages them by telling them of God's faithfulness. 6 : 9–20.

12. The priesthood of Melchizedec,—its glory, 7 : 1–3, its superiority to the Levitical priesthood. 7 : 4–10.

13. Jesus is the true High Priest after the order of Melchizedec, 7 : 11–25, — not of the race of Aaron, 7 : 11–14 ; nor by carnal descent of any kind, but through the absolute dignity of His own person, 7 : 15–19 ; appointed with a divine oath, 7 : 20–22 ; with an unchangeable priesthood, ever living to make intercession for us, 7 : 23–25.

14. Christ being then the true High Priest, He is superior to the Aaronic priesthood not only in the nature of His Priesthood, but also in the nature of His ministrations. 7 : 26–28.

15. This superiority is manifest from the divine and heavenly sphere in which His offices are discharged, 8 : 1–6, as well as from the superiority of the New Covenant under which He acts, 8 : 7–13, as well as by its eternal validity, 9 : 1–12.

16. For the blood of Christ purifies us inwardly, 9 : 13, 14 ; His redeeming death is the consecration of the New Covenant, 9 : 15–23, and His entrance into the eternal sanctuary is the seal of the absolute remission of sin, 9 : 24–28.

17. His own sacrifice of Himself is the complete and only adequate fulfillment of the will of God, 10 : 1–10; He is henceforth exalted to the right hand of God, 10 : 11–14; and His death is the inauguration of that New Covenant. 10 : 15–18.

18. Exhortation to steadfastness in faith and good works. 10 : 19–39.

19. Illustrations of the nature and power of faith. 11 : 1–40.

20. Renewed exhortations to continued perseverance and patience, with warnings against apostasy. 12 : 1–17.

21. Punishment under the New Covenant greater than under the Old. 12 : 18–29.

22. Exhortation to brotherly love, purity, and contentment. 13 : 1–6.

23. Imitate your Christian teachers — bear the reproach of Christ. 13 : 7–17.

24. Closing prayers and salutations. 13 : 18–25.

VI. The Time and Place of Composition.

This Epistle was certainly written before the destruction of the Temple in 70 A. D., for it presupposes not only the existence of that structure, but also the continuation of the Temple services at the time of its composition. "The persons addressed had been long converted to Christianity (5 : 12); they had suffered much in its service (10 : 32–37; 12 : 4, 5); many of their teachers were dead (13 : 7); and they were evidently exposed to various trials which exercised their patience and Christian principle."

These facts necessitate as late a date as possible before the destruction of the Temple. If Paul was the author, it must have been written after his liberation from his first Roman imprisonment in 63 A. D. It was probably written soon after that date, and when he wrote he was probably still in Italy. We date it late in 63 A. D. or early in 64 A. D., without being able to assert absolutely in this matter.

VII. Peculiarities of the Epistle.

These are numerous and marked. The name of the author is not given in it. The bulk of the Epistle is not in the usual epistolary style,— some have held that it is a short treatise rather than an epistle. It is peculiarly scholarly in its composition, being written in better Greek than the other Pauline Epistles. Much has been written about the resemblance between Philo's writings and this Epistle. But it is to be noted that while Philo allegorizes the facts of the Old Testament, so as to convert them almost into myths, this Epistle deals with them as real historical facts, though facts that typified the person and work of Christ. "Hebrews shows that Judaism was the shadow, Christianity the substance; Judaism the picture, Christianity the original; Judaism the husk, Christianity the kernel within; Judaism the body, Christianity the spirit; Judaism the type, Christianity the anti-type: and as the substance is always better than the shadow, the reality than the picture, the kernel wrapped up in the husk than the husk itself, the spirit than the body, the anti-type than the type, so is Christianity better than

Judaism. The word 'better' is the key word of Hebrews." [12]

If comparisons of this kind are allowable, it may be said that this is the Epistle *par excellence* for to-day. Nowhere better than here, can we see detailed the truths of Christianity that need to have a profound hold upon Christians. In this stately and majestic Epistle we can read in language too plain to be misunderstood, the true character of our great High Priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. Whatever doubts may arise as to authorship, they can never hold against the inspiration of this wonderful Epistle, which, in sublime language and with sustained conception of the Person and work of the Redeemer, brings alike the divinity and the humanity of the Saviour to bear on the believer.

[12] Dr. Moorhead in a lecture before Moody's Bible Institute.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Catholic Epistles — General Introduction.

The next group of books that we are to study is commonly called the Catholic or General Epistles. The most satisfactory explanation of the title "Catholic" is that which understands it as meaning those letters which were generally addressed to a wider constituency than the Pauline Epistles. "The term *Catholic* was first employed to denote those Epistles not addressed to any particular individual or church, but to the Church in general, or at least to a wide circle of readers. In the process of time it became a technical term, used to designate that group of Epistles, as distinguished from the other three groups in the New Testament, namely, the Gospels and the Acts; the Pauline Epistles, including the Hebrews; and the Apocalypse." It is true that the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians is really an encyclical Epistle, and therefore Catholic in the sense here used, but it is naturally grouped with the Pauline Epistles. Some reasons might be advanced for including Hebrews in this group, but it also is naturally associated with the Pauline group, even though it may finally be proven that Paul did not write it.

Seven Epistles are embraced in this group, namely, one

by James, two by Peter, three by John, and one by Jude. The Second and Third Epistles of John are addressed to individuals, and consequently are not Catholic in the sense already defined; but at a very early date they became attached to the First Epistle, and therefore are placed with it in this group. It is a matter of history that all of these Epistles were not uniformly accorded a place in the Canon in the early days of Christianity. The Muratori Canon does not mention James, or First and Second Peter. It is well to remember, however, the fragmentary character of this Canon. Eusebius places First Peter and First John among the acknowledged (homologoumena) and the other five of this group among the disputed (antilegomena) writings. He writes, "Among the disputed books, although they are well known and approved by many, are reputed those called the Epistles of James and Jude, also the Second Epistle of Peter, and those called the Second and Third of John."[1] The Byzantine, Alexandrian, and Western Churches held to and used all seven of these Epistles. The Peshito Syriac Version includes only James, First Peter, and First John. "But," says Professor Warfield, "it is very doubtful whether this was the original canon of that church or not rather the result of Antiochene critical revision. Ephraim Syrus of the generation earlier than Chrysostom certainly had all seven Epistles in an older Syriac translation: which seems to show that the Syriac Version before Chrysostom contained all seven of these Epistles. That the seven existed before and were to-

[1] Eusebius H. E. 3:25.

gether considered an element in the make up of the New Testament, seems to follow from the fact that Clemens Alexandrinus commented on them, and Origen possessed them all."

"Subsequently to the time of Eusebius the whole seven Epistles were admitted into the Canon, and are mentioned in the various ecclesiastical catalogues, which were promulgated by the Councils of the Church, or given in the works of the celebrated Fathers. Thus they are contained in the catalogue of Athanasius (330), the Council of Laodicea (363), the Apostolical Constitutions (370), Jerome (390), Augustine (395), the Third Council of Carthage (397), and the authoritative catalogue of Pope Innocent I. (405)." [2]

I. THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

I. Canonicity.

There was some doubt in the early Church in regard to the canonical authority of this Epistle. Eusebius classifies it among the Disputed (Antilegomena) writings, although he does not seem to have participated in these doubts himself. Origen (230) is the first writer who explicitly quotes it. In the extant writings of Clement of Alexandria (195) it is not quoted, yet we know from Cassiodorus and Eusebius that this Clement wrote a commentary on it. Clement of Rome (96) has numerous apparent references or allusions to this Epistle, which it is claimed by some are positive traces of it. There is

[2] Gloag's Introd. to the Catholic Epistles, p. 15.

no question of the use of it by the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120). It is also quite widely acknowledged that Hermas (140–150) used this Epistle. "His use of James and Revelation is beyond all doubt: whole sections are sometimes framed on their words." Of its position in the Peshito Syriac Version, it has been said, "This testimony is of the greatest importance, as the country from which the Peshito proceeded closely bordered on that from which this Epistle originated, and as that testimony was also repeated and believed in by the Syriac Church of the following age." The voices of Irenæus (175) and of Tertullian (190) may doubtless be claimed in behalf of this Epistle, although they do not name it. And going back even to apostolic times, a close examination of the First Epistle of Peter has led many to claim that it is a witness in favor of this Epistle, because of its manifest dependence on it.

Turning now to the *internal* evidence, we may feel that it is positively in favor of the canonicity of the book. Bleek affirms that "the authenticity of this Epistle is vouched for by its entire character and contents." If it was, as some claim, a forgery of the second century, the writer would have been more careful to define his authority and state his office. As it is, the simple designation, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," is strong evidence in its favor. No forger would have been content with that description alone. Among the objections that have been brought up against it, is its asserted conflict with Paul's doctrine of justification by faith (2: 14–26). But there is no real conflict here.

The writers, James and Paul, are looking at the same matter from two different standpoints. A calm investigation of the passage in question is sufficient to show that this objection is unfounded. Reuss has called attention to the fact that this Epistle "contains in itself alone more verbal reminiscences of the discourses of Jesus than all the other apostolic writings taken together."[3] This fact alone proclaims its author to have been an eye-witness of the works, as well as a hearer of the words, of the Lord. And so far as the personality of the writer appears, it is in perfect keeping with the character of the man set before us in the history of the Acts as the prominent James.

This Epistle was called a "strawy Epistle" by Martin Luther, and by him rejected. The basis of his rejection of it was its apparent conflict with Paul. But despite all the objections that have been raised against this Epistle, it is by the Church as a whole immoveably imbedded in the sacred Canon. Its late recognition all over the Church can easily be explained by the facts of the Epistle. There was an uncertainty in regard to its author; it was written for Jewish Christians, and it was supposed by some to be aimed at Paul in a controversial way. All of these things operated to retard its progress into the general recognition. But at length it did win its way, and it obtained its due, and by the verdict of all parts of the Church was accorded a place in the Canon. And so far not a single writer has advanced a strong enough argument to even shake its position in that Canon.

[3] Reuss' History of the N. T., p. 140.

II. The Authorship of the Epistle.

Which James mentioned in the New Testament was the author of this Epistle? This question has occasioned no little controversy among scholars, and there is by no means any general agreement on this matter as yet. The author designates himself as "James a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." It is to be noted that the author does not in any place claim to be an Apostle. There are but three candidates for the honor of having written this Epistle. They are James the son of Zebedee and James the son of Alphæus, both of whom were Apostles, and the James who became so prominent in the church at Jerusalem, and is called the Lord's brother. Some scholars claim that James the son of Alphæus is the same person as James the Lord's brother.[4] Very few persons have ever thought of ascribing this Epistle to James the son of Zebedee, who died in 44 A. D. The next question that confronts us is in regard to the asserted identity of the other two Jameses mentioned.

Against the identification of these two men, it may be noted, (1.) that the brethren of Jesus are always represented in the New Testament as a different set of men from the Apostles (John 2:12; Matt. 12:46; Mark

[4] This intricate question cannot be examined in all its details in this work. The reader is referred for the fuller discussion of this question, as well as that of the relation that existed between the Saviour and those men who are called "the brethren of our Lord," to such works as Andrews', Farrar's, and Lange's Lives of Christ, and Bleek's, Weiss', Davidson's (1st Ed.), Gloag's, Michaelis', and Salmon's Introductions, Huther on James, Lightfoot on Galatians, Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, etc.

3 : 21, 31; Luke 8 : 19; John 7 : 3; Acts 1 : 14; 1 Cor. 9 : 5). And then we have the statement of John that Jesus' brethren did not believe in Him (John 7 : 5). (2.) There is no intimation that James the son of Alphæus was the brother of Christ, or that he was in any way related to Him. Four women, and not only three, are mentioned in John 19 : 25, unless we can believe that two sisters bore the same name, Mary, which is highly improbable. (3.) This theory necessitates several assumptions; namely, that the word "brethren" really means cousins; that Alphæus and Clopas are the same name; that three women only are mentioned in John 19 : 25; and that Mary, the mother of Jesus, had a sister of the same name, who was the mother of James the less, or James the son of Alphæus and Joses; that Acts 1 : 13 should read as in the Authorized Version, "Judas the brother of James," and not as given in the Revised Version, "Judas the son of James." If any of these assumptions are overturned, it is fatal to the whole theory. Now it is by no means proven that Alphæus and Clopas are in reality the same name. Unquestionably four women and not three only are mentioned in John 19 : 25. And there is no real reason for assuming that the word brethren is not used in its natural sense.

Assuming, then, that these two names belong to different men, it is evident that James the son of Alphæus could not have been the author of this Epistle. This leaves James, the Lord's brother, the James who occupied such a prominent relation to the church at Jerusalem, as the only possible author. It now remains for us to

define the relation of this James to our Lord. According to the Helvidian theory,[5] which is here adopted, James was a younger brother of Jesus, and the son of Joseph and Mary. This theory maintains that the brethren of our Lord were the natural children of Joseph and Mary, and younger than Jesus; and that there were four sons, namely, James, Joses (or Joseph), Jude and Simon, together with some unnamed daughters (Matt. 13 : 55, 56). These children, wherever referred to, are usually associated with Mary. So far as the Gospel record is concerned, Alphæus is only directly mentioned as the father of a James and a Joses. Hegesippus informs us that Clopas had a son, named Simon. It has been objected, assuming that Alphæus and Clopas are the same name, that it would be unlikely that there should be so many of the same names who were cousins. Hegesippus tells us that the Simon he names was the first cousin of James the Lord's brother, that Joseph and Clopas were brothers. But even if it is true that there were three brothers named James, Jude, and Simon, the sons of Clopas (and grant-

[5] Five important theories have been held on this subject; namely, (1.) The Helvidian, which supposes that the brethren of Jesus were His actual brothers, younger children of Joseph and Mary. (2.) The Epiphanian, which supposes that they were half-brothers, the children of Joseph and an earlier wife than Mary. (3.) The Hieronymian, which supposes that they were cousins, the children of Alphæus and Mary the supposed sister of the Virgin (John 19 : 25). (4.) The Langeian, which supposes that they were cousins, through Joseph and not Mary, being the children of Clopas, whom Hegesippus states was the brother of Joseph. (5.) The Theophylactian, which supposes that Clopas, brother of Joseph, having died childless, Joseph by a levirate marriage raised up children to his brother, which children were thus as (legal) sons of Clopas our Lord's cousins, but as (natural) sons of Joseph, His brothers.

ing, for the sake of argument, that Clopas and Alphæus are the same name), there is nothing strange or unlikely in the reduplication of the same names in the families of brothers. "Others regard it as a decisive proof that Mary had no other son, that Jesus upon the cross should have commended her to the care of John (John 19 : 26, 27). But, why, if James and Jude were Apostles and His cousins, sons of her sister and long inmates of her family, and it were a question of kinship, did He not commend her to their care? If His brethren were at this time, as we may suppose, unbelieving, and thus in a most vital point without sympathy with her, we can well understand why He should give John, the disciple whom He loved, to be her son, not so much to supply her mere bodily needs, as to comfort and strengthen her in the peculiar trials through which she would be immediately called to pass."[7] Some hold that James is identified with the son of Alphæus in Gal. 1 : 19, being there called an Apostle. But this hinges entirely on the use of the words there translated "except," an inference denied by others. But that passage does not necessarily call James an Apostle, even though it may at first sight seem to do so.[8]

It is to be further noted that the brethren of our Lord are always mentioned in connection with Mary. The natural interpretation is that they were her own sons, and not her nephews. They lived with her, and always stand in the relation of actual sons to her. The real

[7] Andrews' Life of Our Lord, p. 115.

[8] The Greek words *ei me* except the verbal idea of the sentence, which may be more fully translated, "But other of the Apostles I did not see, yet I saw James, the Lord's brother."

reason for the attempt to prove that they were not her own sons is found in the desire to preserve the perpetual virginity of Mary, a cardinal doctrine in the Romish Church. But, however laudable a purpose that may be from a certain standpoint, it ought not to be allowed to overturn the positive arguments that may be advanced in favor of her having borne children by natural generation.

Having established the relationship of James to our Lord as being that of actual brotherhood, it remains to give a sketch of his life. He unquestionably was the oldest of the brethren of Christ. To him the Lord appeared after His resurrection (1 Cor. 15 : 7), vouchsafing to him a special revelation of His risen self. That that appearance dissolved all of James' former doubt is undeniable. From that time forth he became a loyal believer in Christ's Messiahship. This fact accounts for James' appearance among the believers in Acts 1 : 14. When Paul came to the Council of Jerusalem in 50 A. D., James had become one of the pillars of the Church (Gal. 2 : 9). He, at least as early as 44 A. D., had become prominent (Acts 12 : 17). His position at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15 : 12 ff.) was that of special prominence, he apparently being the presiding officer at that conference. And when Paul came to Jerusalem at the end of his third missionary journey, it was to James that he formally reported (Acts 21 : 18). Although the tendency of the man was towards an ascetic life, he was a married man (1 Cor. 9 : 5). " His attachment to the law is apparent in the Council of Acts 15, where he speaks for the Jewish conscience ; and in Acts 21, where he counsels

Paul—a counsel willingly obeyed—to follow out a peculiarly Jewish rite; and even in Gal. 2: 12, where his name can be used by intense Judaizers." Josephus tells us that his death occurred just after the death of Festus in 62 A. D. It is Eusebius that tells us that the Jews, enraged over Paul's appeal to Cæsar and his being sent in accordance with it to Rome, seized upon James during the interregnum between the death of Festus and the arrival of his successor, and beat him to death with a club.

Many traditions revolve around the name of James, the majority of which are without question unreliable. It is said that he spent so much time in prayer on his knees in the temple that they became as callous as a camel's knees. There is no question of the high esteem in which he was held by the masses of the Jews in the city of Jerusalem, who openly condemned the violence that was done him by some of their countrymen at the time of his death. His life was that of the strictest integrity and uprightness, so that he was well called "The Just." While it is probable that his relationship to Jesus may have aided in elevating him to the high position he held in the Church, yet his own personal qualifications had much to do with that elevation. His rigid keeping of the requirements of the law secured for him the admiration even of unbelieving Jews. "He did not dissever Christianity from Judaism, but regarded Christianity as the development and perfection of Judaism."

"Had not the influence of James been modified and completed by that of a Peter and especially a Paul, Christianity perhaps would never have cast off entirely

the envelope of Judaism and risen to independence. Yet the influence of James was necessary. He, if any, could gain the ancient chosen nation in a body. God placed such a representative of the purest form of Old Testament piety in the midst of the Jews, to make their transition to the faith of the Messiah as easy as possible, even at the eleventh hour. But when they refused this last messenger of peace, the divine forbearance was exhausted, and the fearful, long-threatened judgment broke upon them. And with this the mission of James was fulfilled. He was not to outlive the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple." [9]

III. To Whom Addressed.

The Epistle is addressed "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad," i. e., to the Dispersion (Gk. Diaspora). Some have understood this address as meaning Christians in general, taking the term in a figurative sense. Others think it is meant to include all Jews, whether believers or not. A third class would limit it to the Jewish Christians outside of Palestine, and this is doubtless the correct view. The writer addresses his readers as "brethren;" they were persons who had "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ." Dr. Gloag writes, "The readers, whoever they were, were at least Christians. James rests his authority upon his being a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ (1 : 1); he speaks of his readers as having been begotten again by the word of God, and as possessing the faith of the Lord

[9] Quoted from Dr. Schaff by Gloag, Introd. to Catholic Epistles, p. 43.

Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory (2: 1); he mentions those who blasphemed that worthy name by which they were called (2:7); and he exhorts them to wait in patience the advent of Christ (5 : 7). Besides it does not appear to have been the custom of the Apostles to write Epistles to those who were not Christians; and if they did so, it could only be with the intention of converting them to Christianity; but in this Epistle no attempt at conversion is made." [10]

It had long been the policy of the various powers that had successively ruled over Palestine, to send out colonies of Jews in different directions. This had caused a great dispersion of them over the then known world. On the day of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Spirit, Jews were present in Jerusalem from fourteen different nations. How appropriate it was that the man who stood at the head of the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem should address an Epistle to these scattered Jews who had become believers! All the facts of the Epistle support this idea that it was to believing Jews outside of Palestine that it was addressed.

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

The occasion of the Epistle is to be found in the condition of those addressed. They were suffering persecutions; there was more or less of strife and covetousness among them; and they were greatly disturbed by the experiences through which they were passing. These things led James to write the Epistle.

The object of the Epistle may be gathered from its

[10] Gloag's Introd. to Catholic Epistles, p. 45.

contents. It certainly was not polemical in doctrinal matters; nor was it political, for it rebukes a revolutionary spirit and protests against wars; nor was it ascetic, for it contains "no denunciations of the rich on account of their riches, nor commendations of the poor on account of their poverty." Its design was evidently ethical, for wherein it partakes of a polemical character, it is directed, not against dogmatic errors, but against ethical perversions. "Although there may be a comparative want of Christian dogma, there is no want of Christian ethics, for there is no writing of the New Testament which is more deeply pervaded with the moral teachings of Christ." It aims especially at inculcating an active and practical Christianity in accordance with the royal law of love. "The Epistle is adapted to the conditions of its readers. It seeks to comfort them amid the trials to which they were exposed, but especially to correct the errors of practice into which they had fallen, and to admonish them of the faults to which they were addicted. James presupposes the great truths and facts of Christianity as known, and builds upon them practical Christianity. He dwells upon the government of the tongue; the sin of worldliness, the observance of the moral law; he shows the utter worthlessness of a faith which is destitute of works and of a love which expends itself in benevolent wishes; and he inculcates the principles of that pure and undefiled religion which consists in doing good to others, and in keeping ourselves pure in this world." [11]

"The purpose," writes Canon Farrar, "for which it

[11] Gloag's Introd. to the Catholic Epistles, p. 55.

was written was to encourage the Jewish Christians to the endurance of trial by stirring them up to a brighter energy of a holy living. And in doing this he neither urges a slavish obedience nor a terrified anxiety. If he does not dwell, as assuredly he does not, on the specific Christian motives, he does not at any rate put in their place a ceremonial righteousness. His ideals are the ideals of truth and wisdom, not of accurate legality. The Law which he has in view is not the threatful Law of Moses, which gendereth to bondage, but the royal Law, the perfect Law of liberty, the Law as it is set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. He is the representative, not of Judaism, but of Christian Judaism—that is, of Judaism in its transformation and transfiguration."

V. The Contents of the Epistle.

"The writer does not seem to have set himself down to compose an essay or a letter of which he had previously arranged the heads; but, like one of the old prophets, to have poured out what was uppermost in his thoughts, or closest to his heart, without waiting to connect his matter, or to throw bridges across from subject to subject."

1. Greeting. 1 : 1.
2. On the endurance of trials. 1 : 2–18.
3. On hearing and doing. 1 : 19–27.
4. On respect of persons. 2 : 1–13.
5. On the relation of faith and works. 2 : 14–26.
6. On the control of the tongue. 3 : 1–18.
7. On the evils of strife and evil speaking. 4 : 1–12.
8. On the service of God and mammon. 4 : 13–17.
9. On covetousness and impatience. 5 : 1–11.

10. On needless oaths and the power of prayer. 5: 12–18.

11. Abrupt conclusion about the glory of converting sinners. 5: 19, 20.

VI. Date and Place of Composition.

The author of this Epistle was martyred in the year 62 A. D. It is certain that the letter must have been written before the great Epistles of Paul that touch on the doctrines of faith and justification, for the writer would have been more careful not to come into even seeming conflict with the teachings of the Apostle Paul whose work he indorsed in the strongest way (Gal. 2: 9, 10). It must also have been written before the Council of Jerusalem in 50 A. D., for there is not the slightest reference to the decisions of that conference,—decisions very important in their relation to all Jewish Christians as announcing the verdict of the leaders of the Church in regard to the relation of Gentile Christians to the law. If this Epistle had been written after that event, it would doubtless have made some reference to that Council in which its writer played such an important part. Persecutions raged with great severity against the Christians about 44 A. D., when James the son of Zebedee, the Apostle, was martyred (Acts 12: 1, 2). Now this Epistle was written while its readers were still suffering from persecutions. In accordance with these facts, we are doubtless right in dating it about 45 A. D. It is consequently the earliest book of the New Testament in time of composition. It was written at Jerusalem.

VII. The Peculiarities of the Epistle.

One of the most marked features of this Epistle is its manifest dependence on the Sermon on the Mount. It is saturated with the teachings of our Lord, as set forth in that sermon. It is true that James does not allude to the external facts of the life of the Saviour, yet he speaks expressly of Him, and his language "offers the most striking coincidences with the language of our Lord's discourses."

Another peculiarity is dwelt upon by Dean Howson, who writes, "There is more imagery drawn from mere natural phenomena in the one short Epistle of St. James — 'the waves of the sea driven with the wind and tossed' (1 : 6), 'the flower of the grass' (1 : 10), 'the sun risen with a burning heat' (1 : 11), 'the fierce winds' (3 : 4), 'the kindling of the fire' (3 : 5), 'the beasts, birds, and serpents, and things in the sea' (3 : 7), 'the fig, olive, and vine, the salt water and fresh' (3 : 12), 'the vapor that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away' (4 : 14), 'the moth-eaten garment' (5 : 2), 'the rust' (5 : 3), 'the early and latter rain' (5 : 7), 'the earth bringing forth her fruit' (5 : 18) — than in all St. Paul's Epistles put together." [12]

II. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

I. Canonicity.

The first writer who quotes this Epistle by name is Irenæus (175). Following him Tertullian (190) and Clement of Alexandria (195) do the same, and from that time on the Epistle is referred to by name by an increas-

[12] The Character of St. Paul, p. 8, note.

ing number of writers. Turning back to the earlier witnesses, we find an undeniable reference to it in Second Peter 3 : 1. Clement of Rome (96) repeatedly quotes its language, and the same is true to a certain extent of Polycarp (116) and of the Epistle to Diognetus (117). The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120) also doubtless uses it. Papias (120–130) and Hermas (130–150) make use of it. To these witnesses must also be added the names of Melito of Sardis (170), Theophilus of Antioch (168–182), and the Letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (177). Certain heretical sects also of the first half of the second century, the Marcosians, the Simonians, and the Basilidians, used it. This external testimony is so strong that Renan says, "This First Epistle of Peter is one of the writings of the New Testament which are most anciently and unanimously cited as authentic."

The *internal* evidence of the book points in the same way. It was written before the destruction of the temple (4 : 17), and it is evident that it was addressed to those who were themselves converts to the Christian faith, and not the children of converts. The writer had seen Christ (5 : 1). And a close comparison of the speeches attributed to Peter in the Acts with this Epistle shows that the writer of this Epistle was the man who spoke those speeches. The author of this Epistle had as close acquaintances Mark and Silvanus, who are evidently the same persons as those thus named in the Acts. Furthermore the Epistle makes an explicit claim to Petrine authorship.

All of these facts demonstrate the right of this Epistle to a place in the sacred Canon. This was the unanimous

and unhesitating belief of the early Church. The assaults that have been made upon this Epistle have been utterly powerless in the face of all this positive testimony to shake its position in the faith of the Church of all ages. As a rule, the attacks that have been made have been based on the assumption of a real and unreconcilable hostility between Peter and Paul. This assumption is absolutely without any foundation, for this Epistle proves on the contrary that there was a real and substantial unity between the two great Apostles.

II. The Authorship of the Epistle.

The claim of the Epistle that it was written by Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, is supported by the evidence that has already been cited, for proof of its canonicity is proof as well of its genuiness. By the last quarter of the second century it was quoted all over the Church as the Epistle of Peter. Weiss says, "We perceive that the author was actually one of the primitive Apostles from the vividness with which the image of Christ's innocent and suffering life is before his mind (2 : 21 ff.; cf. 1 : 19; 3 : 18); from the way in which experience of the revolution wrought by the resurrection of Christ and His exaltation in those who witnessed them, evidently lies at the foundation of the utterances in 1 : 3, 21 (cf. also 3 : 19; 4 : 13; 5 : 1); from the manner in which he reflects on the loss of those who have not seen Jesus and yet have loved Him (1 : 8); from the way in which he lives in reminiscences of the words of Christ, while his whole doctrine is only a testimony, requiring no medium of re-

flection, to the acts of salvation and their effects as witnessed by himself." [13] There can be no question of the fact that the person who wrote this Epistle was the same person who spoke the speeches attributed to Peter in the Acts. The language, as well as the thoughts of the two proceed from the same person. "The author of this Epistle had a young friend named Mark; so had Peter (Acts 12 : 12). He had a companion named Silvanus (Silas); so had Peter (cf. Acts 15 where Silas is a messenger of the council of which he was a member); he had a large acquaintance with the writings of Paul, with whose teachings he fully agrees, and this was true of Peter, not only according to Acts, but also according to the distinct statement of Paul himself in a letter admitted to be genuine (Gal. 1 : 18; 2 : 2, 8, 9). No reasonable doubt can exist as to the Apostle Peter's having been the actual author of this Epistle."

Peter's real name was Simon (John 21 : 15). He was a native Galilean of Bethsaida. His occupation was that of a fisherman. He was a married man, and lived in Capernaum. In business he and his brother Andrew were partners with John and James, the sons of Zebedee (Luke 5 : 7). Andrew and John were led to Jesus by the testimony of John the Baptist, whose disciples they had been. Through the instrumentality of Andrew, Peter was on the following day led to Christ, who gave to him the name Cephas, an Aramaic name of which Peter (Petros) is the Greek translation (John 1 : 42). Peter by reason of his personal characteristics became most prominent among the disciples of Christ. To him, together with John and James, the Lord granted special

[13] Weiss' Manual of Introd., Vol. II., p. 147.

privileges, such as witnessing the raising of Jairus' daughter and the transfiguration of Jesus, and they also were taken farther into the garden of Gethsemane on the night of the betrayal than the others. Peter was impulsive and out-spoken, following too often without reflection the sudden promptings of his nature. To him, however, belongs the honor of having been the first person to confess Jesus as the Messiah. Thus his ardent nature had its peculiar excellencies, as well as its serious defects. He failed terribly when the test of the night of the Saviour's betrayal and trial was applied to him, and denied his Master. And also at Antioch he showed a vacillation of conduct that was little in keeping with either his knowledge, or his experience, or his position (Gal. 2 : 11–15).

During the public ministry of our Lord, after He had chosen him as one of His Apostles, Peter was rarely absent from His side. His personal traits of character made him the natural leader among the disciples, and he generally acted as the spokesman for them. The darkest page in the life of this man is that one on which the story of his denial of Christ is written. But if he sinned deeply, he repented sincerely. After His resurrection, the Saviour honored him with a special appearance (Luke 24 : 34; 1 Cor. 15 : 5). Later the Lord made emphatic his full restoration to his apostolic office (John 21: 15–17). In the early apostolic history, Peter stands forth as the most prominent figure. He was apparently the acknowledged leader of the Christians, though he possessed no more authority than any of the other Apostles. He was the one who acted as a leader in securing a successor to Judas the betrayer (Acts

1 : 15 ff.). On the day of Pentecost it was his voice that heralded the gospel message with such power that three thousand souls were led to Christ. Active in the service of his risen Lord in Jerusalem, he also proclaimed the Gospel in Samaria. He was the man chosen of God to open the doors of the Church for the entrance of the Gentiles,—his own words being, "God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel and believe" (Acts 15 : 7). When Herod Agrippa saw how the death of James the son of Zebedee pleased the Jews, he took steps also to put an end to Peter's career, but the Apostle was miraculously saved from the impending danger (Acts 12). In the council of Jerusalem (50 A. D.) Peter played an important part, advocating the free entrance of the Gentiles without their being required to conform to the Jewish rites and ceremonies. After that time, and as Paul became more prominent in the church at large, and James the brother of our Lord became the recognized head of the mother church at Jerusalem, Peter became less prominent, and his name is not mentioned again in the Acts.

There are only a few references to Peter in the Epistles of Paul. Paul visited him in Jerusalem for fifteen days (Gal. 1 : 18) three years after his conversion, that is about 36 A. D. At Antioch he and Paul came into collision with one another because of the vacillating conduct of the former (Gal. 2 : 11). One of the factions in the Corinthian church assumed the name of the Cephas party, deriving its name from Peter, from which some have inferred that Peter had visited Corinth at some

time. From 1 Cor. 9:5 we gather that Peter was accompanied on his journeys by his wife. When the Apostle wrote his First Epistle he was at Babylon in the Euphrates valley. It is impossible to tell how long he had been there, but it seems most likely that he had been there for some time, and that the activities of his life after the Council of Jerusalem were spent in the East. His Second Epistle was probably written at some point between Babylon and Rome. The Saviour had prophesied that Peter would suffer a martyr's death (John 21:18), and tradition assigns Rome as the place of his martyrdom.

Tradition busies itself more with the name of Peter than that of any of the other Apostles, but there is little dependence to be placed on the bulk of its stories. Professor Warfield says, "In the midst of all this confusion, we can learn but two facts as to Peter from tradition: first, that he suffered martyrdom by crucifixion, and secondly, that the place of his death was probably Rome. That he suffered martyrdom and by crucifixion is indeed implied in John 21:19, and is, so far as the fact of martyrdom is concerned, adverted to by Clement of Rome. Then Dionysius of Corinth declares that he suffered about the same time with Paul. So also Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, etc. Origen tells us that at his own desire he was crucified with his head downwards, which, however, may or may not be true. It certainly is impossible to doubt the main fact, however, that Peter died by crucifixion."

Writing of Peter's character, Professor Gloag says:

"He excelled all the Apostles in zeal, boldness, and impetuosity. Naturally sanguine and impulsive, he was ever ready to come forward and take the lead. Ardent in his attachment to the Lord, it was no vain boast, but the expression of deep affection, when he declared his willingness to die for Him. But like most impulsive men, he was deficient in steadiness, and on two occasions he showed a want of moral courage. Of all the Apostles Peter appears the most human, the most liable to be affected with the frailties and infirmities of humanity; and this human element of his character, ennobled as it was by high aspiration and aims, renders him attractive and lovable. He had not the calm contemplativeness of John, nor the spiritual insight and moral grandeur of Paul, and was better fitted for the task of founding than that of building up the Church." [14]

III. The Persons Addressed.

The Epistle is addressed "to the strangers throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." The Revised Version translates the original more correctly and renders it, "to the elect, who are sojourners of the Dispersion." The question that naturally arises is in regard to the meaning of the term "Dispersion" in this place. James in his Epistle unquestionably uses it with reference to the Jews. Does Peter have the same limitation in mind? This was the understanding for a long time, and it seems at first sight to mean the Jewish Christians in the countries named, but a closer study of the

[14] Gloag's Introd. to Catholic Epistles, p. 124.

Epistles has led most scholars to regard the term as used metaphorically here for all believers, whether Jews or Gentiles. Despite the fact that Peter was the recognized Apostle to the circumcision, and that the Old Testament is frequently quoted in this Epistle, it must be acknowledged that 4 : 3 points to Gentile readers. Then we know that the churches of the regions named, while containing some Jews, were yet predominatingly Gentile in their composition. The Epistle is consequently addressed to all believers in the special regions named in the salutation. Canon Cook writes : "In short, the general tone and special injunctions equally justify the conclusion at which the majority of modern commentators have arrived, that so far from having Israelites exclusively before his mind, the large-minded baptizer of Cornelius gave his deepest and most earnest thought to a body in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile, in which Christ is all in all." [15]

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

Peter had evidently received some very recent information in regard to the condition of the Christians to whom he writes. Now it was doubtless to Mark that the Apostle owed his information, for that evangelist was with him when he wrote this Epistle. In Col. 4 : 10 Paul enjoined the Colossians to receive Mark, if he came to them. From this we infer that Mark had then in prospect a trip to Asia Minor. From thence he went on to Babylon to Peter, giving him a full account of the

[15] Bible Commentary, Introd. to 1 Peter.

Churches he had visited while in Asia Minor. This account led Peter to conceive the plan of communicating with those Christians, in order that he might give them his advice. It is probable that Mark's report led Silvanus (Silas) to desire to go to the regions described, and consequently he became not only the amanuensis of the Apostle, but also the bearer of the letter to its destination.

The object of the Epistle is stated in the words, "By Sylvanus a faithful brother unto you, as I suppose, I have written briefly, exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand." According to these words, his object was twofold, namely, to exhort and to testify. The hortatory character of the Epistle is its predominating feature. The primary object of the Apostle, then, was to exhort them to stand fast in the face of the trials and temptations to which they were exposed. Along the line of the secondary object of the Epistle, that of testifying, "this Epistle is Peter's publication of his agreement with the Apostle Paul, and his reply to the misrepresentations of the Judaizers, who were using his name to undermine the faith of the Christians of that region."

V. The Contents of the Epistle.

Inasmuch as it partakes of the usual freedom of an epistolary communication in its construction, this Epistle is not capable of formal divisions. The following, however, will indicate the general outline of its contents:—

I. Salutation. 1 : 1, 2.

II. Thanksgiving for the blessings of the plan of salvation. 1 : 3–12.

III. The Main Portion, consisting of various exhortations. 1 : 13–5 : 9.

1. To earnest Christian living, founded on the hope of glory. 1 : 13–2 : 10.
   - (*a.*) To a holy walk in the fear of God. 1 : 13–21.
   - (*b.*) To brotherly love. 1 : 22–25.
   - (*c.*) To growth in their lives as the people of God. 2 : 1–10.
2. Special directions as to the duties of various classes of people. 2 : 11–4 : 6.
   - (*a.*) Christians to unbelievers. 2 : 11, 12.
   - (*b.*) Christians to civil rulers. 2 : 13–17.
   - (*c.*) Servants to their masters. 2 : 18–25.
   - (*d.*) Wives to their husbands. 3 : 1–6.
   - (*e.*) Husbands to their wives. 3 : 7.
   - (*f.*) Christians to one another. 3 : 8–12.
   - (*g.*) Christians in persecution. 3 : 13–4 : 6.
3. Special exhortations. 4 : 7–5 : 9.
   - (*a.*) To the practice of Christian graces. 4 : 7–11.
   - (*b.*) To joyful bearing of suffering as Christians. 4 : 12–19.
   - (*c.*) To elders to do their duty. 5 : 1–4.
   - (*d.*) To the young. 5 : 5.
   - (*e.*) To humility and watchfulness of life. 5 : 6–9.

IV. Concluding Portion. 5 : 10–14.

1. Benediction. 5 : 10, 11.
2. The object and bearer of the Epistle. 5 : 12.
3. The closing salutations. 5 : 13, 14.

VI. The Date and Place of Composition.

This Epistle must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (4 : 17). And its evident dependence on Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians forbids our dating it before the time of the composition of that Pauline Epistle. The date of Peter's death was probably 68 A. D. These facts necessitate dating it at some time between 63 and 68 A. D. Mark and Silas were with the Apostle when he wrote, and the letter was sent to its destination by the hand of Silas. It has been noted that Mark was preparing for a visit to Asia Minor, that is, early in 63 A. D. (Col. 4 : 10). The next reference to Mark by Paul is in his Second Epistle to Timothy, where he urges Timothy to bring Mark with him from Asia Minor, that is, late in 67 A. D. Now Mark might have been with Peter during this interim. The probable truth is that Mark left Paul in Rome early in 63 A. D., and visited Asia Minor in accordance with the intimation of Col. 4 : 10. There he found the condition of the churches to be quite critical, and on joining Peter at Babylon, he informed him of their condition, at the same time giving him copies of some of Paul's Epistles, Ephesians and Romans, if not others. Immediately Peter wrote this Epistle, sending it by Silas. This latter name does not help us at all in determining the date, as there is no reference to him after 53 A. D., when he was in Corinth with Paul. According to these facts, we date this Epistle during the year 64 A. D. The place of composition has been mentioned. This must certainly have been Babylon in the Euphrates valley. "The church

that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you." The words "church that is" are supplied in the Authorized Version, not being in the original. Now whatever words are to be supplied, whether these or others, it is plain that the simplest understanding is that it was written from Babylon. But some assert that by Babylon the Apostle really means Rome, since that name was applied to the eternal city in the Revelation. But there is no evidence that at the time of the writing of this Epistle that term was in common use as applied to Rome. We cannot understand why Peter should use a symbolical term in the midst of salutations and directions. The tradition that Peter was the bishop of the Roman church for twenty-five years is rejected by the majority of scholars. That he died a martyr at Rome in 68 A. D., cannot be doubted, but without question he could not have been long in that city, as Paul would certainly have referred to him in some of his letters written from Rome. It has also been objected to Babylon as the place of the composition of this Epistle, that at this time there were few Jews residing there, because of persecutions of Caligula in that region before 41 A. D., and a plague that raged there in 46 A. D. As a matter of fact, however, Babylon was the center of the Eastern Dispersion. And it is also interesting to note that the places mentioned in this Epistle are given in the order in which one would come to them in traveling from Babylon to Rome. In connection with many writers, we may confidently assume that Babylon in the Euphrates valley was the place of the composition of this Epistle.

VII. Peculiarities of this Epistle.

Writers generally have remarked on the manifest parallelisms between this Epistle and other Epistles, especially Romans and Ephesians. Some have used this as the basis of attack upon the Petrine Epistles, alleging that they show so much dependence that they are really not worthy of an Apostle. In regard to this the words of Davidson may be well noted. He says: "The Apostles were imbued with one Spirit. The source of their enlightenment was the same. Their minds were informed by the same Almighty power. Hence, amid constitutional diversities, they exhibited substantial unity of doctrine, aim, and purpose. Their ideas regarding the fundamental verities of Christ's religion were the same, because they were animated by the Holy Ghost, who, according to the promise of the Son, was to lead them into all truth. Certain great ideas were deposited within them by the Holy Ghost, in whose evolution they evinced essential unity amid individual varieties." [16]

And in regard to the relation of the writings of Peter to those of Paul, the same writer says: "Paul had developed the whole scheme of Christianity with a fullness which none of the other Apostles had exhibited. He had dug a wide channel of phraseology for the great ideas of Christianity, which had become their prevailing vehicle. He had moulded and shaped the distinguishing doctrines by his preaching and writing. Was it not natural, then, that Peter, composing one short Epistle,

[16] Davidson's Introd., 1st. Ed., Vol. III., p. 382.

should involuntarily fall into some coincidences of idea and expression? And it was all the more natural that his Epistle should present a kind of parallelism to Paul's, since he was addressing churches reared by the latter and his fellow-laborers, to which he himself stood in no intimate relation. Propagators of error had endeavored to draw them away from attachment to the Pauline doctrine, representing it to be contrary to Peter's. In giving his sanction therefore to the creed and principles of his fellow-apostle, he would more readily write in language similar at times, as he meant to utter similar ideas." [17]

III. THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER.

I. Canonicity

It must be acknowledged at the outset that we do not have nearly as strong external testimony to this Second Epistle as to the First. With perhaps the exception of Philemon and Third John, there is the least attestation to it of all the books of the New Testament. In consequence of this, it has been very much assailed by many writers. Because of this fact, the evidence must be examined with great care.

Instead of taking up first the earliest witnesses, we will begin later in the history and trace this subject backwards. Origen (230), as all admit, had this Epistle, for he not only quotes it by name, but also ascribes it to Peter, carefully distinguishing it from his First Epistle. His use of this Epistle shows that he regarded it as of

[17] Ib., p. 383.

scriptural authority. It is true that he records the fact that doubts had existed as to its genuineness, but he does not at all seem to participate in these doubts himself. Origen's possession of this book presupposes that Clement of Alexandria, his teacher, had it also. Nor are we left merely to infer this, for we have it from Eusebius, and he is supported by Cassiodorus and Photius, that this Clement wrote a commentary on it. Such a fact as this is sufficient to place its date at least as early as the middle of the second century. The extensive knowledge of Clement, who professes to have traveled over the Christian world and to have known the opinions of Christians of every part of the Church, adds great weight in favor of the canonical authority of this Epistle.

Taking another step backward in the history, we find traces in Irenæus of 1 : 15 and 2 : 4–7. The assertion that there are evident traces of these passages in Irenæus is based upon the fact that he makes the same peculiar use of the expressions in them. Theophilus of Antioch (168–182) very probably quotes two passages from this Epistle; while Melito of Sardis (170) likewise shows his dependence on it in one of his Syriac works.

Going back still further, we next meet with very probable references in Hermas (140–150) to it. And in regard to Justin Martyr (145), it may be said with certainty that he had it, for he speaks of certain false teachers, of whom the Lord had forewarned His followers; and in no place but Second Peter 2 : 1 can this forewarning be found. This makes it evident that Justin regarded this Epistle as authority on the Lord's teachings. Judg-

ing from the usage of rare words, we may also be confident that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120) is dependent on this book. Barnabas (106) makes verbal use of this Epistle as an authoritative source. And we may find traces in Clement of Rome (96) which raise a presumption in favor of his recognition of this letter.

Gathering all of these together, it seems as though we could certainly affirm that before the time of Clement of Alexandria, it was in the possession of Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and Barnabas. It is also to be remembered that this Epistle finally acquired authority throughout the whole Church. Not one particle of evidence can be produced that shows that it was ever refused a place in the Canon of the Byzantine, Alexandrian, or Western Church. In the Syrian Church alone does it seem to have been denied a place in the Canon; but even in that case it is possible to show that it was rejected on internal grounds, and then only in the fourth century. Professor Warfield writes: "It cannot be denied, therefore, that it was a part of the Church Canon of the early third century; and the evidence goes further and proves that it was *naturally* in the Canon at this time—that the men of the early third century did not *put* it in, but *found* it in the Canon. It was, therefore, in the Canon of the later years of the second century. . . . But it was commented on by Clement of Alexandria, and has a place in both the Egyptian versions, and in the early form of the Peshito (Syriac), all of which date from the second century. . . . Known all over the Church at this period and securely fixed in the Canon, we find it quoted here and

there, back to the very earliest Christian writers; nay, Justin Martyr, before 147 A. D., quotes it in such a way as to prove that he esteemed it authoritative. . . . Surely the presumption of its canonicity amounts to a moral certainty." [18]

The examination of the internal evidence to the authenticity of this Epistle is inseparable from the consideration of its authorship. The Epistle claims to be by "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ." If this claim is true, it follows, as a matter of course, that it is an authoritative book of Scripture. And as we examine the book, we find that there are reminiscences of scenes that we know Peter witnessed. Thus Peter was one of the eye-witnesses of the transfiguration of Christ, and the writer of this Epistle refers to that event in such a graphic way that it can leave no doubt in our minds but that he personally witnessed that marvelous scene. Undoubtedly, also the prediction of Christ about Peter's death, recorded in John 21 : 18, is the reference of 1 : 14. Furthermore, there is even greater similarity between Second Peter and the speeches of Peter in Acts, than between First Peter and the same. Besides this there are resemblances between this Epistle and the First that are so marked as to prove similarity of authorship. The relation of the writer of these Epistles to Paul is the same in both cases. Thus in First Peter Paul is quoted, and in Second Peter his letters are endorsed by name.

[18] For a masterly defense of the Canonicity and Genuineness of this Epistle, see Professor Warfield's articles in the *Southern Presbyterian Review* of January, 1882, and April, 1883.

Then the two Epistles are dependent; First Peter on Romans and Ephesians, and Second Peter on Jude. There are also many words that are common to the two Epistles.

In the assaults that have been made on this Second Epistle, a prominent one is based on the asserted linguistic differences between it and the First Epistle. But we may dismiss this objection with a concession from Reuss, who says: "We lay no stress on the linguistic differences between the two Epistles which modern criticism has emphasized too much. The two Epistles are too short, have to do with wholly different circumstances, and there are no direct contradictions to be found. Only when spuriousness has been proved on other grounds may this point be taken into account." The Epistle has also been assailed because of its evident dependence on Jude, an Epistle which, it is claimed by the objectors, is not genuine. But we dissent from this verdict against Jude, claiming, as the evidence will show, that it is a genuine Epistle, and if so, there is no ground for attack on Second Peter if it is dependent on Jude.

The relation of this Epistle to the Gospel according to Mark is very interesting. "All antiquity tells us that Mark wrote down what Peter orally taught of the Lord's life and teaching. In First Peter 5 : 13, we find Mark on intimate terms with Peter. Now in Second Peter 1 : 15, the author promises his readers that he will see to it that they shall be in a position after his death to have his teaching always in remembrance, and in this he has especial reference to the *facts* of Christ's life, witnessed to by him, as is proved by the purpose which he expresses

for so arranging, namely, that they may know that they have not followed cunningly devised fables, but facts autoptically witnessed. Surely this seems to promise a gospel. And we have this series: First Peter testifies to Mark's intimacy with Peter; Second Peter promises a Petrine Gospel; antiquity tells us that Mark was but Peter's mouthpiece. Who could have invented that middle term, and so delicately inserted it into Second Peter? Second Peter thus appears a link in a natural chain which is complete with it, and incomplete without it. All three of these sources from which the links are drawn are therefore genuine." [19]

Taking all these things into consideration we may feel confident that this is a genuine Epistle of Peter, having a right to a place in the sacred Canon. The fact that the book itself won its way into the Canon, and finally became a fixed part of it, is worthy of special note. It is true that individuals still are doubtful about its canonical authority; but taking the evidence as it stands, it does not seem to many scholars, and to the Church at large, that there is any real reason for their rejection of it.

II. To Whom Written.

This Epistle is addressed "to them that have obtained like precious faith with us." This address is very general indeed. It is, however, narrowed somewhat by the words of 3:1, which assume that it is addressed to the same readers as the First Epistle was. The writer says, "This second epistle, beloved, I now write unto you." From

[19] Warfield in *Southern Pres. Rev.*, January, 1882, p. 68.

this narrower designation, it is evident that the Epistle was meant primarily for the same circle of believers addressed in the First Epistle, that is, for the Christians of Asia Minor. The "we" of 1 : 16 does not necessarily mean that Peter had personally made known the truth to those to whom he writes. "The body to which Peter belonged, that of the Apostles and evangelists, is meant here by 'we,' some of whom, and therefore the body itself, had preached in Asia Minor." The Revised Version very correctly reads in 3 : 2, "the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles," instead of the rendering of the Authorized Version, which reads, "of us the apostles."

III. The Occasion and Object of this Epistle.

The occasion of the writing of this Epistle was undoubtedly the information that Peter had received of some new outbreak of heresy among the Christians to whom he had written his First Epistle. The heretics had become more active in the dissemination of their poisonous teachings. "We gather that they were denying even Christ that bought them, that is, His divinity (2 : 1), as well as the promise of His second coming (2 : 1 ff.). In their practice they slandered God's mode of righteousness (2 : 2), and they denied the majesty of Christ (2 : 10). They threw disgrace on their profession of Christian liberty (2 : 19), and lived a degraded life (2 : 13). They also seduced the unstable with their own mode of life (2 : 14–18), and naturally enough were ripe for destruction (2 : 12, 19, 20)."

The Apostle's design is given in 3 : 1–3, and 3 : 17, 18. It was twofold; namely, first, to warn them against the false teachers, and, second, to exhort his readers to be progressive in holiness, to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The practical outcome of the doctrinal teachings of the heretics was manifest in vicious and sinful living. It was to counteract this effect that the Apostle writes as he does. The whole Epistle is practically a plea for holiness of life.

IV. Outline of the Epistle.

1. Apostolic address and greeting. 1 : 1, 2.

2. Earnest exhortation to growth in grace and Christian knowledge. 1 : 3–11.

3. Reminder of the ground on which their knowledge rests. 1 : 12–21.

4. Warning against, and denunciation of, the false teachers. 2 : 1–22.

5. Reminder of the character and surety of the teachings that had been given them as to the second advent and the end of the world. 3 : 1–13.

6. Concluding exhortation to make their calling and election sure, including a recommendation of Paul's Epistles, closing with a doxology. 3 : 14–18.

V. Date and Place of Composition.

This Epistle must have been written before the Apostle's death in 68 A. D. Its dependence on Jude necessitates its being dated after the time of composition of that Epistle, that is, after 64 A. D. It is certain, how-

ever, that it was not written long before the death of the Apostle, for it is apparent that he was anticipating that event before long (1 : 14). On the other hand it could not have been written very soon after the First Epistle, judging from a comparison between the two. Accordingly we must place it as late as possible in the life of Peter, and date it early in 68 A. D.

There is no possibility of certainly ascertaining the place of its composition. The First Epistle was written at Babylon, and this one was probably written at some point between Babylon and Rome. There are those who hold that it was written in Rome, but it is probable that Peter came there as a prisoner, and there is no evidence of his being a prisoner when he wrote this Epistle.

VI. Peculiarities of this Epistle.

There are some real distinctive features about this Epistle as compared with the First. In the First the keynote was 'Hope': in this it is 'Knowledge.' Comparing them, Dr. Gloag writes: "The Epistles were written with different purposes, the First being chiefly hortatory, and the Second polemical. The First was written with a design to comfort believers under the persecutions to which they were exposed; and the Second to warn them against the errors of false teachers. Hence in the First Epistle, the author dwelt upon the example of the sufferings of Christ to encourage believers in trial; whereas there was not the same necessity in the Second Epistle. And hence, also, hope was the keynote

of the First Epistle, because its purpose was to sustain believers in suffering; and knowledge was the keynote of the Second Epistle, because its purpose was to establish them in the faith. But in both Epistles the sanguine and hopeful spirit of the Apostle is apparent; in the Second, as well as in the First, the author leads forward the thoughts of his readers to the entrance that shall be ministered to them abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (2 Pet. 1 : 11); in the Second, as well as in the First, Peter is the Apostle of Hope."[20]

IV. THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

I. Canonicity.

The external testimony in favor of this Epistle is strong as could be desired. There are apparent evidences of its influence in Clement of Rome (96) and Ignatius (115). Its use by Polycarp (116) is unquestionable, and we have the testimony of Eusebius that Papias (120) also used it. The writers of the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (115) and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120) show their acquaintance with it. It is found in all the early Versions, as well as in all catalogues and manuscripts. The Muratori Canon (170) speaks of it in connection with the Gospel according to John. And it is to be noted that the use of it by Polycarp and Papias, both of whom were disciples of John, affords the most positive testimony to its canonical authority. And to these two names must be added that of Irenæus, the pupil of Polycarp, who uses it repeatedly, ascribing it to the Apostle

[20] Gloag's Introd. to the Catholic Epistles, p. 217.

John. The concurrent testimony of these three men is sufficient to establish its canonicity, for they form a direct chain of connection with the Apostle to whom by all antiquity this Epistle is ascribed. Lucke says: "Incontrovertibly, our Epistle must be numbered among the canonical books which are most strongly upheld by ecclesiastical tradition." And to this the words of De Wette may be added, who says: "The doubts which have been raised in recent times against the genuineness of this Epistle rest on weak grounds."

Turning to the internal evidence, we find that its voice is none the less clear and strong in the same line. Its author must have been an eye-witness of the life of Christ, for otherwise he could not have written as he did (1 : 1–4; 4 : 14). He had touched the Lord (1 : 1); had been a constant hearer of Jesus' teaching (1 : 3); and had seen His manifested glory (1 : 1–4; 4 : 14, 16). Indeed its whole tone is apostolic, for none outside of the apostolate could have used the authoritative language that is contained in this Epistle. Bleek affirms that "the Epistle does not in the remotest degree give the impression of being the work of one falsely endeavoring to make believe that he was an eye-witness."

The manifestly close relation existing between this Epistle and the Gospel according to John makes them inseparable. We may then claim that all that has already been advanced in regard to the canonical authority of the latter goes to support the former. The two books stand or fall together. Combining all this evidence as it comes to us from all quarters of the early Church, as well as from the book itself, we may feel that its canonical authority is absolutely established.

II. The Authorship of this Epistle.

The name of the author does not appear in any part of the Epistle, but in the Church there has never been any question but that it was written by the Apostle John. The use of this Epistle by Polycarp and Papias, who were disciples of John, as well as by Irenæus, who was a disciple of Polycarp, has already been noted. These names inseparably connect this Epistle with John. Nor do we find anything of moment that is against this verdict until we reach the days of modern destructive criticism. Bleek writes: "From the first, whenever we find this Epistle used and expressly cited, we find also the belief that it claimed to be, and really was, a work of St. John the Evangelist; and we may conclude that this was the universal belief. Seeing that the writer never names himself, we cannot explain this unanimity and universality save on the ground that it was true, and that it originated with the very *first* readers who received the epistle from the writer, and who must have known him, and not from the mere conjecture or invention of later readers. A comparison of this Epistle with St. John's Gospel can leave no doubt on the mind that both are by the same writer; the similarity between them is so striking and so thorough, in character, in thought and language, in distinctive representations and turns of expression, as to be utterly incomprehensible save on the supposition of identity of authorship."[21] Dr. Warfield sums up the argument for identity of authorship as follows: "(a.) The language and the style of the two are the

[21] Bleek's Introd. to the N. T., Vol. II., p. 186.

same; (b.) the circle of theological ideas is the same; (c.) the personality lying back of the writing is the same in both books; (d.) there are numerous passages which are truly parallels between the two writings, the phenomena of which lead to the belief of identity of authorship."

And furthermore, it may be noted, that the substance of this Epistle is in absolute keeping with the character of John, as we are acquainted with it from other sources. No one outside of the inner circle of the disciples of Christ could have written this marvelous Epistle; and of the disciples, not one of them but John, the beloved disciple, could have framed these sentences. There can be no reasonable doubt but that the man who wrote the Fourth Gospel also wrote this Epistle, and wrote it at the same time he wrote his Gospel.

III. To Whom Written.

This question necessarily involves that of its relation to the Fourth Gospel. If we can ascertain the destination of that Gospel, we have the answer to this question, for the two books were manifestly composed at the same time. But while there are most unmistakable points of resemblance between these two books, there are also differences occasioned by the purposes in view in their respective writings. "There are characteristic differences to be noted between the Gospel and Epistle. Perhaps it may even be said that the predominant burden of the two is slightly different; that of the Gospel being 'Jesus is the Christ,' that of the Epistle, 'Christ is Jesus;' the one as a historian taking up the man Jesus and proving

His divine glory by His life and words; the other as a practical application to the needs of the time, showing that the divine Saviour really became flesh. The Gospel is written from the point of view of the historian; the Epistle from that of the preacher against the errors of his flock. The Epistle is written in the words of the Gospel — the Lord's teaching has become the teaching of the beloved disciple; but the Lord's words have become in the transfer aphoristic, sharply defined, and adapted to present needs. In the Gospel, John lives in the past; in the Epistle, he brings the past to bear on the present and lives in the present. The differences thus amount only to the natural differences between the historian and the preacher: the recorder of facts of teaching and the applier of the teaching to present needs." [22]

The resemblances also are striking and numerous, so much so that they necessitate a close relation in time and purpose. The Gospel must have been written first, for it forms the background for the Epistle. The first four verses of the Epistle presuppose the recording of the facts there referred to. But where is that record to be found, if not in the Fourth Gospel? 1 : 4; 2 : 12–14 point definitely to just such a record as we have in the Gospel. Indeed, as has been well said, "These passages, taken in connection with the unepistolary character of the letter — which can only be explained by the supposition that it was written and sent under such circumstances as would render the naming of the author on the one hand unnecessary, and personal salutations to individuals on the

[22] Warfield's Lectures to his students.

other hand impossible — seem to raise a valid presumption that the letter was a companion document to the Gospel, sent with it to apply, more practically than was possible in its own pages, the truths there brought out, to the lives of its readers."

From this it is manifest that this Epistle was written for the benefit of the same persons as the Gospel, that the Apostle had them in mind as he wrote. The Fourth Gospel was written for Christians in general, although the needs of the Christians in and around Asia Minor were kept especially in mind by the author.

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

If what has been advanced as to the relation of this Epistle to the Fourth Gospel is correct, its occasion is to be found in the desire of the author to apply the history he gives in his Gospel to those for whom it was written. There can be no questioning of the polemical import of this Epistle, although that was not the only, nor even the main, purpose of the writer. The occasion of this Epistle, then, is to be found in the desire of the Apostle to personally apply the facts of that Gospel history.

The Apostle plainly tells us the purpose he had in writing. "These things write we unto you, that your joy may be full," and "these things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." Alongside of these words, we may place the expressed purpose in the composition of the Gospel by the same writer. "These

things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name" (20:21). Surely these words indissolubly bind the two together.

During the lull that followed the Neronian persecutions there had been a great development of heretical ideas among the churches of Asia Minor. Gnostic and Ebionitic heresies had become very prevalent, in which the true humanity, as well as the true divinity, of Jesus had been denied. Cerinthus, with whom tradition brings John in contact, was the most prominent leader among the heretics. The object of the Epistle, consequently, "was practical, to warn against and stop the progress of heresy; to bring the facts of the Gospel against it. It is in this spirit he meets the false tendencies rife about him: with the desire to save souls rather than to intellectually confute error. And therefore, he meets error by assertions pointing back to the facts of the Gospel rather than by argument."

The primary object of the Epistle was the edification of believers, confirming them in their faith in Christ as the Son of God, the propitiation for the sins of the world. The polemical element has been noted. Of this Dr. Gloag writes: "But the polemical element forms only a small portion of this Epistle. John did not write merely to confute gainsayers or to attack the heresies which were then prevalent. He aimed at practical godliness. He wished to establish believers in the truth and in the practice of the truth. All his exhortations are with a view to this. He has an intense hatred of sin and an intense love of holiness. What he has chiefly in view is the promo-

tion of fellowship with the Father and the Son, and, by means of this, fellowship among believers. He especially exhorts believers to entire severance from the world. The world is the kingdom of Satan ; it is the enemy of God ; it lieth in wickedness. Herein consists the great contrast between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. All that is in the world,— its lusts, its allurements, its rewards,— are not of the Father. And certainly, at the period when John wrote his Epistle, the world was in a state of extreme degradation, and no warnings against it could be sufficiently emphatic, and no denunciations of it sufficiently strong."[22]

V. Outline of the Epistle.

This is quite difficult to give, and many different outlines have been suggested by different writers.

I. Introduction. 1 : 1–4.
   1. Purpose of the Gospel. 1 : 1–3.
   2. Purpose of this Epistle. 1 : 4.

II. Main body of the Epistle, in which is made the practical application of the Gospel to its readers. 1 : 5–5 : 12.
   1. Statement of the sinful condition of man. 1 : 5–10.
   2. The provided remedy in Christ. 2 : 1–11.
   3. Effects of union with Christ. 2 : 12–17.
   4. The divine power of Christ. 2 : 18–29.
   5. The love of God for us. 3 : 1, 2.
   6. Our relation to that love. 3 : 3–7.
   7. Statement of false ideas as to sin and righteousness. 3 : 8–12.

[23] Gloag's Introd. to Johannine Writings, p. 229.

8. Exhortations to brotherly love. 3 : 13–5 : 4.
   (*a.*) This a fruit and proof of love. 3 : 13–24.
   (*b.*) Test of teachers, and warning. 4 : 1–6.
   (*c.*) Argument for brotherly love founded on God's love for His children. 4 : 7–5 : 4.
9. The witnesses to these truths. 5 : 5–12.

III. Conclusion. 5 : 13–21.

1. Fuller statement of the object of the letter. 5 : 13–17.
2. Solemn and positive affirmations. 5 : 18–20.
3. Final exhortation against idolatry. 5 : 21.

VI. Date and Place of Composition.

This book must have been written in a time of external peace, and long after any special opposition from without. It was also written to advanced Christians, that is, to those who had long been Christians. Nor was it written until the heresies that Paul had dealt with had assumed more developed forms, while the controversies of Paul's day in regard to the doctrine of justification by faith had died out. These facts necessitate as late a date as possible, but one before the outburst of persecution under Domitian. It must have been written before 94 A. D., and doubtless we are not far out of the way in dating it about 90 A. D.

As to the place of composition, it may be said, that we have no absolute data, but nothing is in conflict with the idea of its having been composed at Ephesus, where, as we have already seen, John unquestionably resided for many years, exercising a pastoral watch care over the churches of that region, many of which had been organized by the Apostle Paul.

VII. Peculiarities of the Epistle.

There is in this Epistle the usual simplicity of the Apostle's style, and comparatively few words are used in it. "The language is Greek, but the form of expression is Hebrew. There is a picturesqueness of style, a Hebrew rhythm, like that of the Old Testament prophets, which shows that the writer, although writing in comparatively pure Greek, was a Hebrew poet and a profound student of the Old Testament. But, along with this simplicity of language, there is a profundity of thought. Few of the writings of the New Testament require more patient study to discover the full import of the thoughts which the words convey, or to fathom the doctrines which are there asserted in apparently simple aphoristic terms."[24]

The key-word of the Epistle is *Love*. But while the undercurrent of the Epistle is directed by love, this feature does not prevent the Apostle from using the sternest language in his denunciations of all that is not in keeping with love. While John is here the stern preacher of righteousness, he is also the tender and loving disciple, who hopes by his words to win the followers of Christ, whom he addresses, to the full acceptance of His divinity. Well may the Christian dwell in thought on the utterances of the Apostle in this inimitable Epistle, until, by closer union with the Saviour it reveals, he imbibes more and more of the love so prominent in it. What a thrill of rapture passes through us as we read

[24] Gloag's Johannine Writings, p. 232.

the ecstatic burst of 3: 1, 2! Who is there that can saturate his mind with the words of the third and fourth chapters, without growing more and more into the likeness of the Saviour whose love they depict? Who is there, who, realizing the sinful tendencies of his nature, is not emboldened to turn away from his sin to God, when he has the assurance that we have an Advocate with the Father, even Christ Jesus the righteous? What consolation to know that the vilest sinner may be cleansed in the blood of Jesus Christ, God's own Son? Applying the facts of the Gospel history as contained in the Fourth Gospel to our hearts and lives, will they not lead us to "walk even as he walked"?

V AND VI. THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

These two Epistles are so closely associated together that it seems best and most convenient to treat them together.

I. Canonicity.

On account of the character and brevity of these Epistles, it would be unreasonable to expect many quotations from them in the early Christian literature. The first distinct reference to them is found in the Muratori Canon (170), where mention is made of "two Epistles bearing the name of John." In speaking of the Gospel according to John, the writer of this Muratori Canon seems to associate with it the First Epistle. The theory has already been advanced that the First Epistle was a companion piece to the Fourth Gospel,[25] having been issued with it as a practical application of the facts

[25] See on First John.

written in that Gospel to those to whom it was addressed. Does not the Muratori Canon support this idea by the way in which it appears to link them together? For this reason, it is held, that the two Epistles mentioned together must be the Second and Third Epistles as we have them. Irenæus (175) and Clement of Alexandria (195) explicitly quote the Second Epistle by name, but Origen (230) is the first person in whose extant writings the Third Epistle is quoted by name. We know that Clement of Alexandria wrote a commentary on all the Catholic Epistles, and consequently he must have included this one. The second century Versions—the Old Latin, the Egyptian and the Syriac (in the original form that is earlier than the Peshito)—include this Epistle. Eusebius, it is true, classes these Epistles among the *disputed* books, but it is evident that he unhesitatingly accepts them himself as being of apostolic origin and authority. "The whole fourth century Church accepts them, as is witnessed to by the various lists of that century and its great writers as well as all fourth century MSS., and Versions."

Turning to the Epistles themselves, we find that the internal evidence is not without weight on this matter. No conceivable object can be suggested for their forgery, for they contain nothing distinctive in doctrine or otherwise. Bleek writes: "Both Epistles present such an affinity with First John in ideas, exposition, and language, both generally and in particulars, as to lead us to attribute them to the same writer; for this affinity cannot be explained as an imitation. The little that is peculiar to these Epistles as distinct from the First Epistle and the Gospel, is not of a character to warrant the sup-

position that they have come from a different hand, and is far outweighed by the points of resemblance." Of the Second Epistle no less than seven or eight of its thirteen verses are to be found in the First Epistle. And in regard to the Third, it can be said that the writer not only describes himself in the same way as in the Second, and writes generally in the same language and style, but also that the same phrases appear in both Epistles.

The fact of the matter is that these two Epistles must stand or fall together. Against them no cogent arguments can be advanced. The most that can be said is that the references to them do not appear until late; but this is easily accounted for on the basis of their brevity and character, as well as by the fact that there were individual doubts in the Church as to their authorship. In the third century the Church in all quarters, with the possible exception of the Syrian Church, and that only after a critical revision of their Canon, accepted these Epistles as of apostolic origin and authority. Only absolute proof to the contrary, which is certainly lacking, can avail to set aside this well-nigh universal acceptance of these Epistles.

II. The Authorship of these Epistles.

In neither of these Epistles does the author name himself. He simply calls himself "the elder." But all antiquity affirms that they were written by a man named John. The Muratori Canon ascribes them to the Apostle of that name; and so also do Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria. Origen is the first who mentions doubt as

to their authorship. Eusebius affirms the existence of a "presbyter John," a contemporary of the Apostle John, basing this idea on an inference he draws from some words of Papias. But scholars are by no means agreed that Eusebius' inference is correct. And the existence of this presbyter John, as a person distinct from the Apostle John, is very doubtful. No reference is made to such a person before the time of Eusebius, unless his interpretation of the words of Papias is correct.

On the other hand, the words already quoted from Bleek show that there is a very close relation between these letters and the First Epistle, which all acknowledge was written by John, the author of the Fourth Gospel. First John is anonymous like these Epistles. And the whole tone of these is as Johannean as the First Epistle. It is to be noted that the author in both of these Epistles calls himself "the elder," and by that title he may mean "the aged," referring to the fact that the writer belonged to the last generation, and not to the fact that he claimed to be par excellence "the elder." It is evident, then, that the internal evidence, as well as the external testimony, wherever we have any such testimony, is strongly in favor of the Johannean authorship of these two Epistles.

III. To Whom Addressed.

The Second Epistle is addressed "unto the elect lady and her children." There have been two general explanations of this address. Some have understood the term "elect lady" as meaning either a particular church, or else the Church universal. If the latter idea is cor-

rect, then, this is truly a catholic Epistle. On the other hand, there are a great many scholars who think that the words of the address are to be taken literally, and that the letter is consequently addressed to a certain Christian lady and her children. Against the former idea, it may be urged that it introduces a metaphorical usage into a plain prose letter. In addition to this, it may be affirmed that it is impossible to find warrant for the use of the word "kuria" (translated "lady") as meaning "church." Very probably the word "kuria" should be understood as a proper name. In that case the letter is addressed "unto the elect Kyria." This is in harmony with the character and contents of the Epistle itself.

Of this matron Kyria, we know nothing except what may be gathered from the letter itself. She was a Christian, and probably did not reside very far from Ephesus. She had a family of grown children, some of whom, at least, were Christians. Her exemplary character had endeared her to the Apostle. It is evident that John was contemplating a visit to her home, when he would speak more at length to her on the matters referred to in this Epistle.

The Third Epistle is addressed to "the well beloved Gaius." We find three men of this name mentioned in the New Testament, namely, a Macedonian (Acts 19 : 29), a Corinthian (1 Cor. 1 : 14; Rom. 16 : 23), and another who lived in Derbe (Acts 20 : 4). We have no means of ascertaining whether the one addressed in this Epistle is one of these three or not. All that can be said is that this Gaius was a person who, because of his genuine

Christian character, received the highest commendation from the Apostle. Two other men are also named in the Epistle, Demetrius and Diotrephes. Of these two men, we gather from the Epistle that Demetrius was a true and earnest Christian; while Diotrephes, who seems to have been an officer in their church, was a bold, unscrupulous, and ambitious man, whose conduct brings upon him the severe censure of the Apostle. It is probable that the persons who bore the First Epistle to the church, of which they were all members, had been rejected by Diotrephes. He may have been a prominent representative of the heresy that John condemns in his First Epistle. In that case it was natural for him to reject the Epistle sent by the Apostle, as well as the messengers who carried it.

IV. The Occasion and Objects of the Epistles.

The Second Epistle was occasioned by the information received in regard to some of the children of Kyria. "John has learned that amid the declensions of Christian life and the frequent fallings away from the truth which had occurred since the rise of Gnostic teaching in Asia, some of the children of this beloved matron are involved and likely to be led away into destruction." This is the occasion of the Epistle. And its object was to warn Kyria and her family of the danger to which they were exposed, as well as to entreat them to be steadfast and watchful. It at the same time enjoins them to have nothing to do with the disseminators of heresy, not even to receive them into their home, or to bid them "Godspeed."

The Third Epistle was brought out by the fact that Diotrephes had been using his authority in the church to resist the truth and protect heresy. Gaius, on the other hand, had received John's messengers, whom Diotrephes had rejected, and had kindly treated them. The Apostle, therefore, writes to commend Gaius for the stand he had taken in this matter, and to approve him and his work and strengthen him in his position. The Apostle at the same time commends Demetrius and condemns Diotrephes.

V. Contents of the Epistles.

The following is an outline of the contents of the Second Epistle:—

1. Address and Greeting. 1–3.
2. Expressions of joy in regard to the children who were standing firm. 4.
3. Exhortation to love and obedience. 5, 6.
4. Warning against dangerous anti-Christian teachers. 7–9.
5. Warning against extending hospitality to such persons. 10, 11.
6. Promise to visit them. 12.
7. Greetings from Kyria's sister's children. 13.

The following is an outline of the contents of the Third Epistle:—

1. The Address. 1.
2. Personal good wishes. 2–4.
3. Gaius commended for his Christian hospitality. 5–8.
4. Diotrephes condemned. 9, 10.
5. Demetrius commended. 11, 12.
6. Will not write any more at present. 13.
7. Promise to visit Gaius, and closing salutation. 14.

VI. Date and Place of Composition.

Both of these Epistles were unquestionably written at Ephesus. As there are no time marks in these Epistles, it is impossible to affirm just when they were written. It is, however, well-nigh certain that they were composed after the First Epistle. We cannot be far out of the way when we date them about 91 A. D.

VII. THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

I. Canonicity.

"Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so-called Disputed Epistles, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the Church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. It was too unimportant to be a forgery, few portions of the Holy Scripture could, with reverence be it spoken, have been more easily spared; and the question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the Canon."

But turning to the external evidence, we find that this letter is remarkably well authenticated, when we consider its brevity and the nature of its contents. The allusions to it in Barnabas (106), Polycarp (116), and Hermas (140–150) are rather uncertain; but it is plainly mentioned in the Muratori Canon (170). Clement of Alexandria (195) quotes it by name, and Tertullian (190), Origen (230), and Cyprian (248) do the same. Eusebius, while classing it among the Disputed Books, tells us that it was well known by many, and that it was publicly used

in most of the churches. It is in the Old Latin Version, but not in the Peshito Syriac, although we know from other sources that Ephrem Syrus used it. By the early fourth century it was almost universally recognized.

In regard to the internal evidence in this matter, it must be acknowledged that it is not so strong. De Wette writes: "No important objection to the genuineness of this Epistle can be made good; neither the use of the apocryphal Book of Enoch, nor the resemblance of verses 24 and 25 to Romans 16: 25, nor a style of writing which betrays a certain familiarity with the Greek tongue. The Epistle is the less open to suspicion, as the author does not distinctly claim to be an Apostle, nor can a pretext for forgery be discovered."

The real basis of attack upon this Epistle has been the uncertainty about its authorship, and its asserted use of the apocryphal Book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses, as well as its relation to Second Peter. There are, indeed, those who deny that Jude quotes this Book of Enoch, but even granting that he does, how does that fact affect its authenticity? Paul undoubtedly secured the names of Jannes and Jambres, the magicians who withstood Moses, from some Jewish tradition. Why cannot Jude use the curious legend about the contest between Michael and Satan over the body of Moses obtained from some rabbinical sources as well? The Old Testament writers frequently used extra-canonical sources of information. Why cannot the New Testament writers do the same?

The fact that this book won its way into the Canon of

the New Testament at an early day despite the attacks that had been made upon it, is greatly in its favor. The use of it in Second Peter cannot be denied, it being used in that Epistle in something like the same way that First Peter uses Ephesians and Romans. We may conclude, then, that the fact that it has stood all the attacks that have been made upon it in ancient and modern times, affords presumptive evidence in favor of its canonical authority.

II. The Author of this Epistle.

It claims to be by "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James." Now, although there are no less than six Judes mentioned in the New Testament, of whom do we here think but of the man who was a brother of *the* James, who was so prominent in the Jerusalem church, the author of the Catholic Epistle bearing the name of James? It is certain that the author of this Epistle was not an Apostle, although the phrase "servant of Jesus Christ" does not forbid that, for the author seems expressly to exclude himself from the number of the Apostles, when he says, "Remember the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ." Among the Apostles there was a Jude or Judas (not Iscariot), but he unquestionably was the *son* and not the brother of one James. We cannot but adopt the plainest interpretation of the writer's description of himself, and conclude with many leading authorities, that this Jude was none other than the brother of that James who was so prominent in the Church that the

mere mention of his name was sufficient. He was Jude the brother of the James who was the brother of our Lord.

Of this Jude we know nothing directly. Like James, he did not believe in our Lord until after His resurrection. The traditions concerning him are conflicting and uncertain. Western tradition affirms that he labored among the Persians. Syrian tradition says that he went to Assyria and died a martyr in Phœnicia. It is evident that he was content to do the work of his Saviour-brother in an unostentatious way, and he probably sealed his faith by a martyr's death.

III. To Whom Addressed.

It is addressed to "them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." These words prove it to be truly a Catholic Epistle. It is addressed to Christians generally, although a close examination of the contents will show that the author had in mind especially those who were acquainted with Jewish history. It is probable that Jude had in mind particularly the Jewish Christians of Palestine. "Although the Epistle is in form catholic, addressed to the Christian Church in general without any restriction as to locality, yet from the nature of its contents it is evident that it must have been directed to Christians belonging to some particular church, or residing in some particular district."[26]

[26] Gloag's Catholic Epistles, p. 364.

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Epistle.

The occasion of the writing of this Epistle was the growth of heretical opinions and the spread of immoral conduct, together with the desire of the writer to do something to check the progress of that which was threatening the purity of the Church. The design is clearly stated by the author. "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ" (3, 4). From these words it is apparent that Jude's design was not only to instruct and confirm, but also to urge them to stand up for their historic faith against all who tried to corrupt it.

The description of these ungodly persons is painted in the darkest colors. Although professing to be Christians, they were excessively immoral. They were in the Church it is true, but they had "crept in unawares." And as they denied Christ it is manifest that they were heretics, but worse still, and as a result of their heresies, they were utterly and grossly immoral. Theoretically they were heretical; practically they were guilty of the most unblushing immorality. Their false doctrines and loose conduct went hand in hand. It was for this reason that Jude wrote to confirm and strengthen and in-

struct the faithful, as well as to denounce these ungodly persons.

"The main body of the Epistle is well characterized by Alford as an impassioned invective, in the impetuous whirlwind of which the writer is hurried along, collecting example after example of Divine vengeance on the ungodly; heaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and as it were laboring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the licentious apostates against whom he is warning the Church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language was insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel."

V. The Contents of the Epistle.

1. Salutation. 1, 2.

2. Reason for writing. 3, 4.

3. Historical argument, proving that the ungodly will certainly be punished. 5–7.

4. Application of this with the contrast of godly conduct. 8–10.

5. Denunciation and description of these evil-workers. 11–13.

6. Proof from prophetic utterances that the ungodly will be punished, and the application thereof. 14–19.

7. Earnest exhortation to the faithful in regard to themselves and their attitude toward the ungodly. 20–23.

8. Benediction and doxology. 24, 25.

VI. Date and Place of Composition.

This Epistle must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. "If that event had occurred, we do not see how Jude, as a strict Jewish Christian, could possibly have omitted that awful calamity which made such a powerful impression on all Jews in his examples of the destructions which befell the ungodly; to Jude it must have appeared the most striking of all the instances of divine wrath, and the most appropriate for his purpose." The Epistle must also have been written before Second Peter, if we are correct in claiming that the latter is dependent on the former. The Epistle could not have been written at an early date, for sufficient time must be allowed for the development of heresy of belief and error of conduct. Taking all these things into consideration, it is probably correct to date it about 64–66 A. D.

As to the place of composition, there is not much to be said. It is most probable that it was composed in Palestine. It may have been written in Jerusalem before the commencement of the Jewish war that ended in the destruction of the city and temple.

VII. Conclusion.

It is interesting to note the inseparable connection between correct beliefs and right living, as set forth in this Epistle. It is a mistaken idea that the Church of the early days were perfectly pure, for then as now, the greatest obstacles to the progress of the Church were

within and not without. And in these days there is no little need for just such an appeal as this is to all Christians to protect historical Christianity against all the attacks of her enemies, whether they be in the Church or out of it. We have need to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."

CHAPTER IX.

The Revelation.

The title of this book might better have been "The Apocalypse" by an adoption, rather than "The Revelation" by a translation, of the original Greek title. The word thus rendered in general signifies "a disclosure by God of truths that are themselves secret and unknown." The reference of the title is to future events. The word "Apocalypse" designates a peculiar type of prophecy, which expresses itself not so much in predictive as in symbolical utterances by which the course of future events was made known. "Apocalyptic writings are distinguished from those which are simply prophetical by their predictions referring to the last days, and by their preponderant use of symbols and visions."

I. Canonicity.

There are traces of the use of this book in Barnabas (106), Ignatius (115), the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (115), and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (120). Papias (120), according to the testimony of Andreas and Arethas, Bishops of Cappadocian Cæsarea in the fifth and sixth centuries, definitely refers to this book, regarding it as an inspired writing. Hermas (140–150) has remarkable coincidences with it, and Justin Martyr (145) mentions it by name as proceeding from the Apostle John.

Eusebius refers to a treatise by Melito of Sardis (170) upon this book, and also informs us that Apollonius (170) used it. It is enumerated in the Muratori Canon (170), and was cited by Theophilus of Antioch (170). There are also some undeniable quotations from it in the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (177). Irenæus (175), Tertullian (190), and Clement of Alexandria (195) quote it by name, ascribing it to John. In the third century, Hippolytus (220) and Origen (230) use it as authoritative Scripture. The first writer who directly assails it is Dionysius (250). "Nor did doubt, when it had thus once entered the Church, spread rapidly. The third century closes without giving us the name of another doubter, and although Eusebius himself wavers, and tells us that opinion in his day was much divided, and soon afterwards the Syrian Church rejected it,— not without affecting the judgment of individual writers in Jerusalem, Asia Minor, and Constantinople,— yet Eusebius believed it to be inspired and canonical, the doubts were purely of an internal kind, the Church at large was never affected by them, and the storm even in the East, was soon weathered." [1]

Marcion, as might be expected from his heretical ideas, rejected this book, together with the other Johannean writings. The Alogi also, on account of doctrinal considerations, refused to recognize it as a part of Scripture. It was likewise omitted from the Peshito Syriac Version. The difficulties connected with the interpretation of the book unquestionably had no little to do with the doubts that arose in the minds of individuals in regard to its canonical authority. But most of all that was urged against

[1] Warfield in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia.

it were the apparent divergences between it and the other writings of John in doctrinal conception, spirit, style, and language. In Reformation times it was rejected by Luther, Erasmus, and Zwingle. And also in the present century, many have raised objections to it on one account and another.

It is to be noted, however, that the objections that have been urged against it have all been founded on internal considerations, and not on any lack of external testimony to its early use and recognition. The early acceptance of the book unqualifiedly attests its recognized canonical authority. And it was not until the third century that the slightest doubt arose in regard to it, and even then these doubts were confined within very narrow limits.

The internal evidence supports this external testimony. In four places the author calls himself John (1 : 1, 4, 9; 23 : 8). He claims to have been an eye-witness of the Saviour's earthly career, and he also uses the language of apostolic authority. It is evident, then, from the book itself that its author was a prominent and important personage, one who sustained a close and authoritative relation to the churches of Western Asia Minor. "He is acquainted with their history, their necessities, their spiritual condition, their trials."

II. The Authorship of the Book.

This is so closely related to the subject of its canonicity that the treatment of these two subjects is well-nigh inseparable. The opinion of the early Church was positively in support of the Johannean (Apostle) authorship of the book. It has already been noted that it claims to be by a John. Justin Martyr directly affirms that this

John was the Apostle John. In regard to this man's testimony, Weiss writes: "Justin's direct statement that it was written by John, one of the Apostles of Christ, is the more significant since his home was in Palestine, and he had learned in his wanderings to know the Alexandrian and Roman Churches as also that of Asia Minor in which the book had its origin, equally well, and therefore represented the tradition of the whole Church of the second century."[2]

To whom would we most naturally ascribe the book than to the Apostle John,— that John whose pre-eminence was so great as to make him the one of whom people would instantly think on the mere mention of the name John? But it is objected that this idea is negatived by the dissimilarities between it and the other Johannean writings,— dissimilarities in doctrine, spirit, style, and language. In answer to this objection, Gloag writes: "Although we admit these dissimilarities and differences, yet we do not think that they are of so strong or decided a character as to necessitate us affirming a diversity of authorship. The difference in doctrine is slight, and is fairly accounted for by the apocalyptic nature of the Revelation. The difference in spirit is more manifest, but is also accounted for by considering the subject-matter of the writings. The differences in language and style are still greater, but are lessened by considering the different circumstances under which these works were written, and the necessary influence of his Old Testament models on the author of the Apocalypse, and are to a

[2] Weiss' Introd., Vol. II., p. 51.

considerable extent counter-balanced by undoubted and peculiar similarities."[3] Some have thought to preserve the identity of authorship of these books by claiming that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of the Temple, and therefore about thirty years before the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel. By thus separating them in time, they hope to account in a satisfactory way for their diversities. And indeed if there were not other and stronger reasons for dating this later than the Fourth Gospel, there would be no little reason in this line for the early date assigned.

Others again ascribe the book to the Presbyter John mentioned by Papias, holding that he was a different person from John the Apostle. But there are good reasons for doubting whether Papias did really mention two different men of the name John. Prof. Charteris writes: "Apart from questions of canonicity there is as great division of opinion as to authorship. The scraps of Papias have been as fruitful of works upon the two Johns as in works upon the original of Matthew's Gospel, or upon the 'order' of Mark. Dionysius, though in a very diffident manner, took refuge in the supposition that Presbyter John was the author. But against this Irenæus is decided. Moreover, if Irenæus and Arethas be right, Papias, as a 'hearer of John,' is an ultimate authority, and Papias' testimony seems to be distinct; so that the authorship by the son of Zebedee is established."[4] Irenæus, who frequently cites this book, as-

[3] Gloag's Johannine Writings, p. 311.
[4] Charteris' Canonicity, p. 358.

cribing it to the Apostle John, was the disciple of Polycarp, who in his turn was the pupil of the Apostle. It is impossible to deny the force and clearness of Irenæus' testimony in this matter, and it ought to decide the whole question.

By a very few writers the book has been ascribed to Cerinthus, the great heretical opponent of John. This Cerinthus was the exponent of a view of the millennium that was utterly sensuous in its conception. The reference of this book (chapter 20) to the millennium was made the basis of this idea. But this theory met with but little acceptance, and it cannot be entertained for a moment in the face of the claims of the book itself as to its authorship, as well as of the direct testimony of the early Church to its Johannean authorship.

It is to be noted that many German writers of this century, who reject the Johannean authorship of the Fourth Gospel, acknowledge that in this book we have a genuine product of the pen of the Apostle John. If then we are to believe the testimony of the early Church, we must accept its verdict that John the Apostle wrote the Apocalypse. Internal considerations alone have ever been the cause of wavering in this opinion. Dr. Ezra Abbot writes that the author is "the acknowledged channel of the most direct and important communication that was ever made to the seven churches of Asia Minor, of which John the Apostle was at that time spiritual governor and teacher. The writer was a fellow-servant of angels and a brother of prophets — titles which are far more suitable to one of the chief Apostles, and far more likely to have been assigned to him, than to any other man of less distinction. All these marks are found

united together in the Apostle John, and in him alone of all historical persons. We must go out of the region of fact into the region of conjecture to find such another person. A candid reader of the Revelation, if previously acquainted with St. John's other writings and life, must inevitably conclude that the writer intended to be identified with St. John."[5]

Summing up the evidence,[6] we must conclude that John the Apostle was the only possible author of this book, and consequently it is of apostolic origin and canonical authority.[7]

III. To Whom Addressed.

This is very clear from 1 : 11, where we read, "What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea." These cities were all situated in what was known as Proconsular Asia. It is probable that these Seven Churches were selected as representatives, for we know of the existence of churches at Colossæ, Hierapolis, Miletus, and Troas, and there were probably many others in the same

[5] Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

[6] The following early writers declare it to be by John the Apostle; namely, Justin Martyr, the author of the Muratori Canon, Melito of Sardis, Theophilus of Antioch, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Victorinus, Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Epiphanius, Basil, Hilary, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Didymus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome.

[7] The most elaborate defense of the Johannean authorship of this book is to be found in Dr. Lee's Introd. to his Commentary on the Revelation in the Bible Commentary. See also Dr. Warfield's Article on the Unity of the Book in the Presbyterian Review of April, 1884.

general locality. The number seven recurs repeatedly in this book, and this number of churches may have been selected to preserve the symmetry of the whole.

Of these Churches, the first named is Ephesus, which was the capital of Proconsular Asia. This was a magnificent city, famed for the grandeur of its buildings, and also because it contained one of the seven wonders of the world, the temple of Diana. To-day it is "a miserable village called Ayasalook." Smyrna remains to this day an important and flourishing city. Pergamos, now known as Bergamah, and a city of some size, was in John's day a place of renown on account of its school and extensive library, as well as its magnificent temple dedicated to Æsculapius. Thyatira still continues to exist with a considerable population under the name of Akhissar. Sardis, once famed as the proud city that was the royal residence of Crœsus, has nothing left of its former grandeur, and is a little village known as Sart. Philadelphia also remains to this day, having lost its former name, and is now called Allasher. Laodicea, the last named, was destroyed by an earthquake in Nero's day, and arose afterwards with new and greater splendor from its ruins, but only to sink again into utter ruin. To-day nothing remains of it to mark its former site but dreary desolation and destruction.

"From the Epistles addressed to these Seven Churches we learn something of their condition when the Apocalypse was written. There is a symmetry in these Epistles; the Churches are first blamed for what evil is in them, then commended for their good points, and a promise is given to those who continue faithful. There is a considerable difference among them: the Churches

of Smyrna and Philadelphia are entirely commended — no faults are attributed to them; whereas the Church of Laodicea is wholly blamed — no words of praise are bestowed upon it. The other four Churches of Ephesus, Sardis, Pergamum, and Thyatira, are partly commended and partly blamed. These Churches had evidently existed for some time; they had gone through a stage of experience. Several of them had degenerated; they had left their first love and their early zeal had cooled. The Churches were persecuted; some of them were tried and had tribulation; and in the Church of Pergamum, where Satan's seat is, in allusion perhaps to the worship of Æsculapius, whose emblem was the serpent, mention is made of Antipas, who had suffered martyrdom (Rev. 2:13). Heresies had arisen in these Churches; certain forms of Gnosticism had made their appearance. In most of the Epistles, reference is made to internal corruptions; in the Epistles to Ephesus and Pergamum, special mention is made of the Nicolaitanes; in the Epistle to Pergamum, of those who held the doctrine of Balaam; and in the Epistle to Thyatira, of the woman Jezebel, who called herself a prophetess and who seduced the servants of Christ." [8]

IV. The Occasion and Object of the Book.

The occasion of this book was the explicit direction of the risen Lord to John to write it. The condition of these Churches demanded a direct communication, and there was need for unveiling the future for the instruction of the Church at large. The book is described and its purpose unfolded in its opening words: "The Revelation

[8] Gloag's Johannine Writings, p. 315.

of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to show unto his servants the things which must shortly come to pass." From these words, it is evident that the direct messages to the Churches named were of minor importance, and that the main purpose was to make known the final victory of the Church. This ultimate triumph of the kingdom of Christ over His enemies is the prominent feature of the book. "The great moral design is to comfort and support Christians under the trials and persecutions to which they were exposed, by assuring them that these trials were of short duration, and that their enemies would at length be conquered and destroyed."

V. The Contents of the Book.

Of all the outlines of the contents of the book that have been suggested by different writers, that of Professor Warfield is the best.

Prologue. 1 : 1–8.
1. The Seven Churches. 1 : 9–3 : 22.
2. The Seven Seals. 4 : 1–8 : 1.
3. The Seven Trumpets. 8 : 2–11 : 19.
4. The Seven Mystic Figures. 12 : 1–14 : 20.
5. The Seven Vials. 15 : 1–16 : 21.
6. The Sevenfold Judgment. 17 : 1–19 : 10.
7. The Sevenfold Triumph. 19 : 11–22 : 5.

Epilogue. 22 : 6–21.

"The sevenfold subdivision of each section is easy to trace in all cases except in 4, 6, and 7, where it is more difficult to find and is more doubtful." [9]

[9] Warfield's Article in the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia.

VI. *The Date and Place of Composition.*

There are in general but two opinions on the question of the date of this book. By some it is assigned to a date before the destruction of Jerusalem in the reign of Galba or Vespasian; by others it is dated about 96 A. D., in the reign of Domitian. The majority of critics to-day assign it to the former date, and hold that it was composed just after the death of Nero in 68 A. D. By these critics it is held that the internal evidence of the book is that it was composed before the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem (11:1, 2, 8; 20:9). Then again it is contended that there is a designation of the time of its composition in the account of the seven heads of the beast, which are held to represent seven Roman emperors. "The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is one of the seven" (17:9–11). The five that are fallen are said to be Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero. The one in power was Galba; "and the seventh, who is yet to come, is Otho, his successor, as Galba's reign was expected to be of short duration on account of his extreme age." It was generally supposed that Nero was not actually dead, but that he was in hiding somewhere in the East, and would sometime reappear and regain his throne. This coincides with the description of the eighth king, "the beast who was and is not, and is of

the seven." According to this theory this book was written during the reign of the sixth emperor, that is. Galba. But it is a mere assumption that this interpretation of this passage is the correct one. It certainly presumes that John coincided with the belief that Nero was not really dead and would appear again. But this belief was a mere legend, that has no actual historical warrant. The term "kings" may not refer to persons but to kingdoms, as it does in the book of Daniel (Dan. 7 : 17, 23), a book that undoubtedly had its influence on John.

Reference has already been made to the fact that some writers have selected this early date in order to give sufficient time between its composition and that of the Fourth Gospel for the author to change his style of writing. It is claimed that John wrote this book before he had acquired a very correct knowledge of the Greek language, and that his residence had been in Palestine and not among a Greek-speaking people. In the Apocalypse, which is intensely Hebraistic, the writer seems to violate some plain rules of Greek construction; while the Fourth Gospel is written in the purest, most simple and accurate Greek. Consequently, it has been held, that the Apocalypse marks the close of the activity among his own people; while the Fourth Gospel was written after many years' residence among the Greek-speaking people of Asia Minor. But this theory is without any historical support, and is only devised to account for the acknowledged differences that exist between these two books. But these linguistic differences can be accounted for on other grounds, such as the different features of the two books,

as well as the different states of the mind of the author at the time of their composition. If for other reasons we must assign the date of the book to the reign of Domitian, instead of that of Galba, this argument for the early date of the book falls to the ground.

But there is an absolute lack of historical confirmation for this early date. Irenæus affirms that the visions recorded in the book were seen at the end of the reign of Domitian. Now the well-known relation of Irenæus to John through Polycarp, his own teacher and John's pupil, makes this testimony strong enough to settle the whole matter in favor of this late date. The writer was in exile on "Patmos for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." Eusebius, Victorinus, and Jerome plainly affirm that it was Domitian who banished John to the Isle of Patmos, and that the Apostle returned from thence to Ephesus on the death of this tyrant. And not one of the early writers connects Nero with John's exile. It is confirmatory of the idea that Domitian was the emperor who did this, to know that it was his custom to banish people for various offenses against his will.

In regard to the internal evidence on this subject, it may be noted that the references to the Churches addressed presuppose conditions in them incompatible with an early date. Ephesus had backslidden, having left her first love; Sardis had a profession of life, but was to all practical purposes dead; and Laodicea was in a lukewarm condition. Then the heresies mentioned had not attained to such development in early days as is evident from what is said of them in this book. The externally prosperous

condition of Laodicea is commented on, but in 62 A. D., it was completely destroyed by an earthquake, and it was not until many years later that it attained to the condition described in Rev. 3 : 17. The persecutions to which the Christians addressed were exposed, harmonize more with the wide-spread and systematic onslaughts on the Church by Domitian, than the persecutions inflicted here and there, especially at Rome, by Nero. Furthermore it is manifest that the author had an intimate acquaintance with these Asia Minor Churches. Now it is absolutely certain that John did not come to Ephesus during the lifetime of Paul. Indeed the late date alone will satisfactorily account for the evidence furnished by the book that the author had for a long time been acquainted with the condition and needs of these Seven Churches.

I am therefore led to believe that the internal evidence supports the external testimony that this book was written at the close of the reign of Domitian, that is, about 96 A. D. The visions were revealed to the Apostle on the Isle of Patmos, and it is most probable that they were immediately committed to writing by John before he returned to Ephesus, and while he was still on the Isle of Patmos.

VII. The Interpretation of this Book.

There is no book of the New Testament that has given commentators greater trouble, or upon whose interpretation there is greater diversity of opinion, than this one. There are in general four different systems of interpreta-

tion: (1.) The Historical theory, which holds that the book is a progressive history of the Christian Church from its beginning to its final consummation. (2.) The Præterist theory, which maintains that the predictive utterances of the book have already been fulfilled; that its principal reference is to the triumph of the Christian religion over Judaism and Paganism. (3.) The Futurist theory, which holds that with the exception of the first three chapters, the book refers in the main to events which are as yet future. (4.) The Spiritual theory, according to which "the Apocalypse is not a professed detailed history of the future, but only a conspectus of the great epochs and of the governing principles in the development of the kingdom of God in its relation to the kingdoms of this world."

VIII. The Peculiarities of the Book.

The symbolism of the book is its most prominent and striking peculiarity. The number *four* occurs frequently, as, for example, there are four living creatures before the throne; four angels at the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds; four angels sent forth to vex the world; a voice from the four corners of the altar; the nations in the four corners of the earth. But the number *seven* is even more prominent; there being seven Churches, seven candlesticks, seven stars, seven seals, seven trumpets, seven vials, seven thunders, seven spirits, the Lamb with seven horns and seven eyes, the seven-headed beast, seven mountains, and seven kings.

This book is the only prophetical book in the New

Testament. And in its general features it bears much the same relation to the New Testament that Daniel does to the Old Testament. It partakes of some of the characteristics of Daniel and Ezekiel. It was written after the models thus furnished it in the Old Testament. Its tone is thoroughly Hebraistic.

The following words of Dr. Gloag may well conclude our studies on this book. He writes: "An author who writes a history employs a different style in writing a poem or a philosophical dissertation. The Apocalypse is a prophecy, the prevision of the future; the Gospel is a history, the recollection of the past. The Apocalypse is, as regards its form, a series of visions communicated to the Apostle. The Gospel is chiefly a record of the discourses of the Lord with His familiar disciples. In the one the imagination is elevated; in the other the memory is exercised. The spirit in which these works were written is very different. In writing the Apocalypse, the author was in a state of ecstasy; he was, like Paul, caught up to the third heavens; a prophetic fire burned within him; visions and revelations from God were imparted to him; his enthusiasm was kindled. In writing the Gospel and the Epistle, on the other hand, the author was calm and collected; the inspiration imparted to him, although of a most elevating nature, was not ecstatic; he wrote in full self-consciousness. As Guericke well expresses it, the Gospel of John was conceived and written in the understanding; the Apocalypse, on the other hand, in the spirit." [10]

[10] Gloag's Johannine Writings, p. 304.

Index of Authors and Subjects.

Abbott, Ezra, 15, 48, 55, 58, 316.
Acts, the, canonicity, 74; authorship, 76; sources, 80; occasion and object, 82; contents, 85; date and place of composition, 86.
Alexander, Lord Bishop of Derry, 106.
Alexander the coppersmith, 228.
Alford, Dean, 143, 152, 189, 233, 238, 308.
Alogi, the, reject Fourth Gospel, 56; reject the Revelation, 312.
Andrews, Samuel J., 20, 252, 255.
Apollos, at Corinth, 128; at Ephesus, 178.
Aquila and Priscilla, 126–128.
Archippus, resident minister at Colossæ, 160; his parents, 169.

Babylon, First Peter written there, 34, 274.
Barnabas, cousin to Mark, 30; separates from Paul, 32; not author of Epistle to the Hebrews, 233.
Baur, 61, 168.
Beet, Prof. J. A., 152.
Berea, 101.
Bleek, F., 57, 61, 77, 108, 146, 250, 287, 288, 297.
Brethren of our Lord, 252–258.
Burrhus, 86, 194, 197.

Canon, not fixed by ecclesiastical authority, 2; meaning of, 2.
Catholic Epistles, name and number, 247, 248.
Cenchrea, 134.
Cerinthus, the heretic, 66, 316.
Charteris, Prof. A. H., 75, 315.
Clement of Alexandria, 65, 234, 236, 278.
Colossians, the Epistle to, canonicity, 157; the Colossian church, 158; occasion and object, 161; outline, 163; date and place of composition, 164; peculiarities, 167; compared with Ephesians, 185.
Conybeare and Howson's St. Paul, 143, 161, 166, 180, 199, 200, 202, 227.
Cook, Canon, 271.

Corinth, the city of, 125; Christianity planted there, 126; Paul's supposed second visit there, 142; composition of church there, 127; factious elements in church, 138.
Corinthians, the First Epistle to, canonicity, 124; the Corinthian church, 125; occasion and object, 128; outline, 130; date and place of composition, 131; concluding remarks, 132; Second Epistle to, canonicity, 133; to whom written, 134; occasion and object, 135; outline, 139; date and place of composition, 141; number of Paul's visits to Corinth, 142; the lost Epistle, 144.
Crete, the island of, 218.

Davidson, Dr. Samuel, 24, 38, 52, 76, 174, 235, 276.
Delitzsch, Franz, 237.
Demetrius, 301.
De Wette, 145, 152, 168, 186, 208, 287, 304.
Diotrephes, 301.
Dods, Prof. Marcus, 7, 80, 132.

Ellicott, Bishop, 143, 158, 162, 176, 208.
Epaphras, founded churches at Colossæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis, 160; visits Paul for consultation, 161.
Epaphroditus, messenger to Paul from the Philippians, 192, 193.
Ephesians, the Epistle to, canonicity, 175; the Ephesian church, 177; destination of the Epistle, 181; occasion and object, 182; contents, 183; date and place of composition, 184; peculiarities, 184; compared with Colossians, 185.
Ephesus, the city of, Paul's first visit, 178; Apollos there, 178; its religious life, 180.
Eusebius, 66, 230, 248.

Farrar, Canon, 54, 88, 94, 145, 260.

Gaius, of Corinth, entertains Paul, 154; Third John written to, 300.
Galatia, situation, 114; Paul's sickness there, 116.
Galatians, the Epistle to, canonicity, 113; the Galatian church, 114; occasion and object, 117; outline, 118; date and place of composition, 120; peculiarities, 123.
Gardner, Frederic, 240.
Gifford, Dr. E. H., 145, 147, 155.
Gloag, Paton J., Pauline Epistles, 95, 99, 103, 113, 115, 129, 134, 138, 152, 158, 176, 185, 188, 198, 220, 229, 240; Catholic Epistles, 249,

258, 260, 270, 285, 306; Johannine Writings, 58, 60, 67, 73, 292, 295, 314, 319, 326.

Godet, Prof., 45, 58, 60, 185.

Gospels, meaning and use of term, 4; number and order, 4; Tatian's Harmony, 5; Irenæus' argument as to their number, 5; witness of Muratori Canon, 6; characteristics, 6; Synoptic Gospels, meaning, 7; for whom written, 7; their origin, 8; Synoptic problem, 8; Norton on their agreements and differences, 9; various theories as to origin, 10; original Aramaic written Gospel, 12; Westcott on need for committing Gospel history to writing, 13; oral preaching the real basis of the Gospels, 14; Mark, the briefest form of that preaching, 15.

Gregory, Prof., 49, 50.

Guericke, 326.

Gwynn, Dean, 188, 190.

Hackett, Prof. H. B., 168.

Harris, Prof. J. Rendel, 205.

Hebrews, Epistle to, canonicity, 230; authorship, 233; to whom written, 241; occasion and object, 241; outline, 242; date and place of composition, 244; peculiarities, 245.

Hobart, W. K., 44.

Howson, Dean, 114, 117, 263.

Huther, J. E., 200, 219.

Irenæus, original language of Matthew, 20; number of Gospels, 5; date of Matthew, 26; concerning Mark, 36.

James, Epistle of, canonicity, 249; author, 252; to whom addressed, 258; occasion and object, 259; contents, 261; date and place of composition, 262; peculiarities, 263.

Jerome, original language of Matthew, 21.

John, the Apostle, author of Fourth Gospel, 58; history, 61; residence at Ephesus, 63; personal characteristics, 64; author of First John, 288; author of Second and Third John, 298; author of the Revelation, 313; banished to Patmos by Domitian, 323.

John, First Epistle of, canonicity, 286; author, 288; to whom written, 289; companion piece to the Fourth Gospel, 290; occasion and object, 291; outline, 293; date and place of composition, 294; peculiarities, 295; Second and Third Epistle of, canonicity, 296; author, 298; to whom written, 299; occasion and objects, 301; contents, 302; date and place of composition, 303.

John, the Gospel according to, canonicity, 55; authorship, 58; for whom written, 65; occasion and design, 65; sources of, 67; contents, 68; date and place of composition, 69; peculiarities, 70.
John the Presbyter, same as John the Apostle, 299, 315.
Journal of the Exegetical Society, 117, 121.
Jowett, Prof., 121, 151.
Jude, the brother of our Lord, 305; Epistle of, canonicity, 303; author, 305; to whom addressed, 306; occasion and object, 307; contents, 308; date and place of composition, 309.

Kay, Dr. William, 238.
Kyria, Second Epistle of John addressed to, 299.

Lange, J. P. E., 41.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 58, 63, 115, 121, 159, 170, 193.
Lost Epistle of Paul, 144.
Lucke, 287.
Luke, the Evangelist, author of Third Gospel, 43; a Gentile and a physician, 44; joined Paul at Troas, 45, 78; not an eye-witness of Gospel history, 46; literary style, 46; a careful historian, 47; relation to Paul, 51; author of Acts, 76; faithful to the end, 224.
Luke, the Gospel according to, canonicity, 42; Marcion's Gospel a mutilated Luke, 42; authorship, 43; sources of, 47; object, 48; for whom written, 49; contents, 50; date and place of composition, 51; relation to Paul, 51; peculiarities, 53.
Lunemann, Prof., 240, 241.
Luther, Martin, 123, 155, 239, 251.

"Man of sin," 108, 112.
Marcion, on Luke, 42.
Mark, the Evangelist, 30; author of Second Gospel, 30; connection with Peter, 30, 36, 38; the young man who followed Jesus when arrested, 31; cousin to Barnabas, 31; with Paul on first missionary journey, 32; his defection, 32; restored to Paul's confidence, 33; associated with Peter, 33; traditions concerning, 34.
Mark, the Gospel according to, canonicity, 28; authorship, 30; purpose, 34; written for the Roman type of mind, 35; contents, 36; date and place of composition, 36; Peter's Gospel, 36; the fulfillment of Peter's promise in 2 Peter 1 : 15, 37; integrity, 39; peculiarities, 40.
Marshall, Prof. J. T., 12.

Matthew, the Apostle, 18–20.
Matthew, the Gospel according to, canonicity, 16; authorship, 18; original language, 20; arguments for Greek original, 21; confused with the apocryphal "Gospel according to the Hebrews," 22; purpose of, 23; an historical argument, 23; fulfilled prophecies noted, 24; contents, 25; date and place of composition, 26; peculiarities, 27; the kingly Gospel, 28.
Meyer, H. A. W., 39, 58, 77, 80, 139, 143, 158, 165, 207.
Michaelis, Prof. J. D., 186.
Moorehead, Prof., 246.

Norton, Andrews, 10.
Nicopolis, in Epirus, 221.

Olshausen, 57, 143, 152.
Onesimus, 170.
Origen, original language of Matthew, 20; destination of Luke, 50; on authorship of Hebrews, 233.

Paley, 75, 134, 168, 176.
Papias, on the "Oracles," 12; original language of Matthew, 20; on Mark, 29.
Paul, the Apostle, 87; conversion, 88; missionary journeys, 89, 90; arrest in Jerusalem, 91; imprisoned at Cæsarea, 91; taken to Rome, 92; released from Roman imprisonment, 199; chronology of life, 93; character, 94; writings, 95; no real hostility to Peter, 82; journey to Spain, 202; last days, 201–204.
Pauline Epistles, the Early Epistles, 98; the Epistles of the Captivity, 156; the Pastoral Epistles, 198.
Peter, the Apostle, history, 265–269; traditions about, 269; character, 270; not bishop of Roman Church, 148, 275; connection with Mark, 38; author of First Peter, 265; author of Second Peter, 277.
Peter, First Epistle of, canonicity, 263; author, 265; persons addressed, 270; occasion and object, 271; contents, 272; date and place of composition, 274; peculiarities, 276; Second Epistle of, canonicity, 277; to whom written, 282; occasion and object, 283; outline, 284; date and place of composition, 284; peculiarities, 285.
Philemon, a Colossian, 169; Onesimus, his slave, 170.
Philemon, Epistle to, canonicity, 167; person addressed, 169; occasion and design, 170; contents, 173; date and place of composition, 173; peculiarities, 173.

Philippi, situation of, 189; Paul visits it, 190; composition of church there, 193; sends present to Paul, 192.
Philippians, Epistle to, canonicity, 187; the Philippian church, 189; occasion and object, 193; contents, 195; date and place of composition, 196; peculiarities, 198.
Phœbe, deaconess of church of Cenchrea, 151; business in Rome and carries Paul's Epistle there, 155.
Plumptre, Prof. E. H., 210.
Porter, Prof. F. C., 72.

Renan, 59, 79, 158, 264.
Reuss, 143, 168, 223, 251, 281.
Revelation, the, canonicity, 311; authorship, 313; to whom addressed, 317; occasion and object, 319; contents, 320; date and place of composition, 321; interpretation, 324; peculiarities, 325.
Romans, Epistle to, canonicity, 145; the Roman church, 148; occasion and design, 151; outline, 153; date and place of composition, 154; peculiarities, 155.
Rome, origin of church there, 148; Peter not bishop of, 148; composition of church, 150.

Salmon, Prof. George, 3, 12, 108, 112, 206, 223.
Sanday, Prof. W., 58, 59.
Schaff, Dr. Philip, 13, 15, 52, 54, 61, 71, 84, 145, 186, 258.
Schenkel, 83, 188.
Schleiermacher, 71.
Schneckenburger, 83.
Silas (Silvanus), Paul's companion, 90; remains at Berea, 101; rejoins Paul, 104; amanuensis and bearer of First Peter, 272.
Sinaitic manuscript, 39, 181, 239.
Stalker, 94.
Stanley, Dean, 64.
Storrs, Dr. H. M., 73.
Tatian, 5, 17.
Thayer, Prof., 232, 233.
Theophilus, Third Gospel addressed to, 49; an historical personage, 49; a representative man, 50; the Acts addressed to, 82.
Thessalonians, First Epistle to, canonicity, 98; church at Thessalonica, 100; occasion and object, 102; outline, 103; when and where written, 104; peculiarities, 105; Second Epistle to, canonicity, 107; occasion

and object, 109; outline, 110; date and place of composition, 111; peculiarities, 112.
Tholuck, 152.
Tigellinus, 86, 194, 197.
Timothy, not writer of "we passages" in Acts, 78; Paul's companion, 90; visit to Corinth, 137; history, 209–211; relation to Ephesian church, 211.
Timothy, First Epistle to, canonicity, 205; the person addressed, 209; occasion and object, 211; outline, 211; date and place of composition, 213; peculiarities, 214; Second Epistle to, canonicity, 222; occasion and object, 224; outline, 226; date and place of composition, 227; peculiarities, 228.
Tischendorf, 5, 39, 148.
Titus, carried First Corinthians to its destination, 130; returns to Paul from Corinth, 135; carries Second Corinthians, 136; history, 215–219; character, 217.
Titus, Epistle to, canonicity, 215; person addressed, 215; occasion and object, 219; outline, 220; date and place of composition, 220.
Tregelles, 39, 148.
Tychicus, bearer of Epistle to Colossians, 162; also to the Ephesians, 182; Paul refers to him, 224.

Usher, Archbishop, 182.

Van Oosterzee, 44.
Vatican manuscript, 39, 181, 239.

Wace, Prof., 200, 206.
Warfield, Dr. B. B., 37, 39, 55, 112, 117, 121, 153, 211, 248, 269, 279, 280, 282, 288, 312, 320.
Weidner, Dr. R. F., 242.
Weiss, Bernhard, 22, 29, 83, 108, 138, 150, 200, 201, 207, 266, 314.
Westcott, Bishop, 2, 14, 41, 54, 58, 231.
Westcott and Hort, 39, 148.
Weston, Dr. H. G., 28.

Zeller, 83.

 PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Merry
Christmas
1923

EDWARD AUGUSTUS GEORGE

The Twelve: Apostolic Types of Christian Men

12mo, cloth.

"Under his living touch the apostles seem very much like the men we know and their problems not dissimilar to our own."—*Congregationalist.*

PROF. W. G. MOOREHEAD

OUTLINE STUDIES in the NEW TESTAMENT SERIES

The Catholic Epistles and Revelation

In One Volume. *New Edition.* 12mo.

Containing James, I and II Peter, I, II and III John, and Jude, and the Book of Revelation.

ALEXANDER CRUDEN

Complete Concordance

Large 8vo, cloth.

New Unabridged Edition, with the Table of Proper Names entirely revised and mistranslations in the meanings corrected, many suggestive notes.

WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D.

A Dictionary of the Bible

Its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History, with Numerous Illustrations and Maps. *A New Worker's Edition.* 776 pages.

NEW THIN PAPER EDITION

The Boy Scouts' Twentieth Century New Testament

Officially authorized by the Boy Scouts' of America. New Thin Paper Edition.

181. 16mo, khaki cloth.

182. 16mo, ooze leather, khaki color,

Contains an introduction by the Executive Board, the Scouts' Oath, and the Scouts' Law.

HENRY T. SELL, D.D. (Editor) *Author of Sell's Bible Studies*

XX Century Story of the Christ

12mo, cloth.

From the text of The Twentieth Century New Testament, Dr. Sell has completed a Harmony of The Gospels which, while studiously avoiding repetition omits no important word in the fourfold record of the earthly life and teaching of our Lord. He has done his work well, and the result is a compilation specially designed and adapted for the use of the average reader

A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D.

Studies in the New Testament

A Handbook for Bible Classes in Sunday Schools, for Teacher Training Work, for use in Secondary Schools and Colleges. 12mo, cloth.

In it are no references to books of any kind outside the Bible. With the help of the maps and a New Testament one can study this work *with no other books in hand.*

REV. JOSEPH T. GIBSON, D.D.

Jesus Christ: The Unique Revealer of God

8vo, cloth.

The author has sought to see, and aid others in seeing Jesus Christ as He is presented in the Scriptures. He has compiled a "Life" neither critical nor iconoclastic, but designed for those who regard the Word of God as being not only the infalliable guide to faith and duty, but the authentic chronicle of the earthly life of our Lord. Dr. Gibson has harmonized the Gospels and from them constructed a graphic narrative which, contrives, to re-limn an old picture with freshness and charm.

REV. GEO. H. YOUNG, M.A., *Ass't Prof. Rhetoric and Public Speaking, Colgate University*

The Illustrative Teachings of Jesus

The Parables, Similies and Metaphors of Christ. 12mo, cloth.

"A most readable and practical treatment of the methods of the Master for the general Bible student and Christian worker. A valuable contribution to one's conception of Jesus as the 'Teacher come from God,' and revealing in life, content of instruction and method of presentation the will of the Father."—*Review and Expositor.*

W. BEATTY JENNINGS, D.D.

The Social Teachings of Christ Jesus

A Manual for Bible Classes, Christian Associations, Social Study Groups, etc. 16mo, cloth.

In a series of twenty studies, the teachings of Jesus are applied to specific social sins and needs of to-day, such as poverty, pleasure, war, the drink traffic, etc., and shown to be the sure and only solution of the problems of society.

ROBERT FREEMAN

The Hour of Prayer

Helps to Devotion When Absent from Church. 12mo, cloth.

"A volume of reverent purpose designed especially for those who wish some form of Sunday observance, or who, by stress of circumstances, are prevented from attending services in the churches. To shut-ins, mothers with young children, nurses and others who are unable to attend public worship, the book will particularly appeal."—*Buffalo Express.*

39 Old Testament
27 New "

08-AKX-191